

# Modern Language Notes

Volume LX

DECEMBER, 1945

Number 8

## ANGLO-FRENCH ETYMOLOGIES

(Second Series, cf. *MLN*, LIX, 223-250)

1. **BALDERDASH.** For this word the NED distinguishes the following meanings: 1. froth or frothy liquid, *obs.* (attested with Nashe 1596); 2. a jumbled mixture of liquors, *obs.* (attested 1611); 3. a senseless jumble of words (attested 1674). As to the etymology, this dictionary remarks:

From the evidence at present, the inference is that the current sense was transferred from 1) or 2), either with the notion of 'frothy talk' or of a 'senseless farrage' or 'jumble of words.' Most etymologists have, however, assumed 3) to be the original sense.

If, as seems most logical, we should accept 1) and 2) as the original concrete meanings of the word, we may appeal to certain Provençal forms which offer themselves (FEW s. v. *brod* 'broth,' 1, 3):

Prov. *bouldro* 'eau sale, mare'; *boudras* 'bourbier'; Peyreleau *bouldras*. Aveyron *bouldra* 'eau sale, mare'; *bouldouyro* 'eau sale; bruit; confusion'; *bouldouyras* 'grosse femme sale'; *bouldouyra* 'troubler un liquide.'

The etymology of these words is far from clear, the more so since we find the stem *\*boldr-* also in Catalan *bóldro* 'a gush of liquid that spurts out suddenly,' in Spanish *a bolondrones* 'suddenly gushing forth,' and in Astorga *boldre* 'the mud deposited on the bottom of a stream': a Latin *\*bullire* 'to boil' + Germ. *brod* 'broth' could well be at the base of this *\*boldr-* stem. Now the same Mediterranean *\*boldr-* stem appears also in Poitou, according to the FEW (this dialect often offers lexicological parallels with the language of the South of France): *boudreille* 'boue,' *boudre(ill)oux* 'couvert de boue,' *boudreiller* 'éclabousser.' It would be possible to assume a Poitou *\*boudreillas* (or *-asse*) 'mud, jumble,' which would be in line with similar *-as* (< *-aceu*) formations such

as OF. *brouillas* 'mist' (13<sup>th</sup> c., the predecessor of the mod. Fr. *brouillard*), Fr. *frimas* 'rime,' mid. Fr. *brumas* (15<sup>th</sup> c.) 'petite brume' (also *brumasse*, *brouillasse*, and the corresponding verbs in -asser are attested)—and, indeed, the Prov. *bould(ouy)ras* formations quoted above. This Poitou \**boudreillas(se)* could have given \**balderlash* (with -ss > -sh as in *lavace* > *lavish*), then *balderdash* (with assimilation or dissimilation).

2. CATERWAUL 'to cry, said of a cat at rutting time.' This word, which is first attested in Chaucer ([a cat] *goon a cater-w(r)awet*, var. -ed) is commented as follows by the NED:

This [verb] occurs in the various forms *caterwawe*, *-wawe*, *-wrawl(e)*, *-wawle*, *-waul*. The second element appears separately in the vb. *wrawen* used (of a cat) by Caxton, *wrawlen*, *wraule* of cats, squalling children, etc., frequent in Googe, Tusser, Holland and others from c 1570 to 1615 or later; *waul* is of doubtful occurrence before 1600. The precise relation between these is not clear; all are prob. imitative of the sound, but whether the forms in -l are formed on the others (cf. *mew*, *mewl*, Germ. *miauen*, *miaulen*, and F. *miauler*) is doubtful. Forms akin to *wawe*, *wrawl* in other langs. are Du. *vraale*, to roar . . . Norw. dial. *rdla*, in the north of Norway 'to cry as a cat,' L. G. *wralen* . . . said of a stallion in heat . . . cf. also Bav. *rauen*, *rauelen* 'to howl, whine,' said esp. of the cry of the cat when in heat. . . . The sense of the Ger. words also comes near the Eng., since both in Chaucer and in the transf. use of the 16-17<sup>th</sup> c., the word was spec. applied to the cry and behaviour of the cat when 'after kind.' As to the -waul form, an exact LG. counterpart *katterwaulen* '(von Kindern) schreien und heulen wie streitende Katzen' is given by Schambach . . . 1858, but its history is uncertain. *Cater* is, of course, connected with *cat*, but the form is not certainly explained: some would see in it a parallel to Du. and Ger. *kater*, male cat, . . . but the word appears too late to prove this. Others would take -er as some kind of suffix or connective merely.

I am convinced that the original meaning of the word, contrary to the first attestations, was 'hideous, discordant howling noise' (as attested only as late as Shakespeare), without intervention of the cat, and that the phonetic influence of *cat* and of *wraw(l)* 'to cry like a cat' is also secondary. This English word family, I believe, is patterned upon a French one, and the explanations of the NED, phonetically as well as semantically, are on the level of 'popular etymologies'—those popular etymologies, that is, which were introduced secondarily, in an interpretative manner, into an otherwise incomprehensible English word family of French origin.

The etymon, in my opinion, is the O. Fr. *chalivali* (attested since

1395), variant *chalibari* etc., in the meaning of mod. Fr. *charivari* (itself attested since 1370), or of Germ. *Katzenmusik*, an ironic serenade of crude music made with kettles, pans, tea-trays etc., which, in France, was resorted to in order to show public derision of incongruous marriages. Since music of this type is easily compared to the cry of cats (cf. Eng. *cat-calling*, Germ. *Katzenmusik*, *Katzen- und Hundemesse* etc., Kluge-Goetze, s. v. *Katzenmusik*; Fr. *musique de chats*, attested since 1694; Bourgogne *faire le chat* 'le charivari,' FEW s. v. *cattus*), and since probably the comparison of a lecherous person with a cat on the prowl offered itself easily, the 'cat' and the 'wauling' came in secondarily.<sup>1</sup> It may even be that, in the Chaucerian form *caterwrawet* -ed, we have an echo of French dialectal forms such as Saintonge *charivariter* 'donner un charivari' (metathesis), cf. the Latinized forms *charavaritum*, *chalvaritum* in Du Cange s. v. *chalvarium*. As for the -w- replacing Fr. -v-, cf. *carry-witchet* < Fr. *écrevisse* + -et, but the English dialectal forms listed by Wright: *cattie-bargie* (-bargle) 'a noisy, angry quarrel among children,' *argie-bargie* (*argle-bargle*) 'to dis-

<sup>1</sup> The para-etymological introduction of the *cat* in *caterwaul* may be compared with the etymological restitution of the *cat* in *caterpillar*, which is itself of a French dialectal origin. It may be said that *caterpillar* is not to be explained after the fashion of the NED (OF. *chate pelouse*, ONorm. *cate pelose* < \**catepelos* with -s taken as a formative element, and the remaining \**catepelo* assimilated to *pillar*), but simply as a derivative from the attested Normandian forms (cf. REW 1779): *katplöz*, *ka(r)pluz* -*plöz* (-r- is an already French insertion due perhaps to a popular etymology: i. e. the immixtion of *char* 'chair': on the map *chenille* of the *Atlas lingu.*, the forms *karplüs* etc. are frequently contrasted with *chenille*, in so far as the first refers to a fatter, furrier ['grosse, velue'] variety of caterpillar). Moreover, we must reckon with the rhotacism well known in Middle French (*cousin* > *courin*: *je vous raime*, *deroseilles* = 'des oreilles,' in Cl. Marot's *Epistre du biau fys de Pasy*) as a reaction against the more wide-spread shift *r* > *s* exemplified by *chaise*, *bésicles*, cf. Nyrop, *Gramm. hist.* I, 343; on the map *chenille* we find still today, in points 247, 249, 356, forms with -r- in the second part of the word: *karplör* etc., and FEW s. v. *cattus* lists also forms with -r- from Aurigny and Guernesey. Thus Norm. *carepelouse* became (with a secondary restitution of *cat*) \**catrepeloure* > *caterpillar*.—The parallelism of *caterwaul* < Fr. *carivali* and *caterpillar* < Norm. *carplür* has been recognized by Sainéan in his earlier book, *Le chat* (*Beiheft 1 zur ZRPPh*, p. 81), though Sainéan was wrong in identifying outright *charivari* with the cry of the cat. But there is no denying that the initial syllable of *c(h)arivari* lent itself to the para-etymological influence of *chat*, *cat*.

pute,' show the *-b-* which is also to be found often in French dialects<sup>2</sup> — along with the *-ie-* which fits in well with the French forms in *-i* (cf. also the form *cattie-wurrie* 'a noisy, angry quarrel among children'). The original English forms, then, must have been something like *\*carriew(v)aul(ie)*.<sup>3</sup> And the *-r-* is the remnant of the *-r-* in *charivali*. The survival of Fr. *charivari* on British soil is established beyond doubt by Scotch *kerriwery*, *carriwary* which the re-edition of Jamieson's dictionary rightly connects with the Fr. word. The *ca-* form points to Normandy or Picardy, and, in fact, the forms *carivari* etc. are attested in the dialects of these provinces, cf. FEW s. v. *caribaría*. Svennung has proved that the etymon of this French word family is the Gr. medical term *καρῆβαρία* 'headache,' litt. 'heavy feeling in the head,' which occurs in late Latin with Oribasius: von Wartburg, basing himself precisely on the *ca-* forms in Normandy and Picardy, infers that we have to do with a very old term, early popularized in France and with a long history — existing at least before the 14<sup>th</sup> century attestations. "Die bed.[eutung] erklärt sich von der wirkung her, die eine ohrenbetäubende katzenmusik auf den kopf des menschen ausübt. Vgl. fr. *casse-tête*."

3. CURLICUE. The definition given of this word by Webster is 'something fancifully curled or spiral, as a flourish in writing.' The DAE gives information of the existence of the word in America: its early spellings are *curlicue*, *curly cue*, *curly Q*, *curlecue*, *curlikew*; it is attested since 1843 as a noun meaning 'an ornamental or fanciful flourish, curve, twist etc., in writing' and as a verb meaning 'to curve or bend fantastically' (e. g. 'her arms went curlecuening over her head,' 'a kind of picket fence made out of iron, all curlecuened over on the sides'). The etymological explanation of the NED: *curly* + *cue* (with the latter representing either Fr.

<sup>2</sup> It is present in Fr. *charabia* 'jargon of the Auvergnats,' 'jargon' — if Sainéan, *Le lang. parisien* 80, is right in connecting it with *charivari*.

<sup>3</sup> The OF. *charivali* survives also in German: *crawallen* 'to make noise' is attested in 1557 in the Suevoian dialect. Whether the German *Krawall* 'noise, upheaval' is identical with the loanword from French is still a moot question. The form *schrabauen* 'to make noise' in the *Missingsch* of J. G. Müller (1779: "dass man den Leuten die Ohren caput *schravauet*," cf. *Zeitschr. f. deutsche Wortforschung* VII, 13), definitely points to a Fr. *chari-* form (with *š-*). Whether the Low Germ. *katterwaulen* is an alteration similar to the one I assume for Eng. *caterwaul* still remains to be seen.



*queue* or the letter Q in its form Q) cannot stand—not so much because of the coalescence of adjective and noun (cf. *whirly gig* > *whirligig*), but because of the lack of spontaneity and flavor which the adjective *curly* would have in such a phrase. Evidently the spelling *curly Q* is only secondary, due to popular etymology.

It seems clear that *curlicue* should be considered in connection with the word *purlicue*, although the NED, in line with its system of rigid partitions, makes not the slightest mention of this possibility. *Purlicue* is attested in Scotland, first with Jamieson: in 1808 he listed the two meanings 'a dash or flourish at the end of a word in writing, a school-term' and 'whims, particularities of conduct, trifling oddities.' Later he added (in the Supplement of 1828) the meanings: 'the peroration or conclusion of a discourse,' 'the recapitulation made by a pastor of a congregation, of the heads of the discourses, which have been delivered by his assistants, on the Saturday preceding the dispensation of the sacrament of the Supper. . . . Also, the exhortations which were wont to be given by him on Monday, on what was called 'the close of the works.' These ecclesiastical meanings, which at first were not listed by the Scottish clergymen, must have been colloquial expressions, evidently derived from the meaning 'final flourish' and they were obviously facetious in tone—as was also the phrase mentioned by Jamieson: 'the close of the works.' The NED gives vague indications of etymological connections between *purlicue* and Fr. *queue* and *parler* or *par la*, *pour la*. Wright, who in his *Eng. Dial. Dict.* attests also for *purlicue* the meaning 'the space enclosed by the forefinger and thumb' (1825), thinks of the French expression [*prendre le roman*] *par la queue*. But this phrase, found in the *Précieuses*, sc. 4, is a humorous expression meaning 'to live like husband and wife before marriage' and implying the reversal of normal procedure; the Scotch *purlicue*, on the contrary, designates an orderly ecclesiastical procedure.

Although the form *purlicue* takes our word family back to the year 1825, it must be considered as a variant of the later attested *curlicue*, *curlecue*—which, in turn, I would identify with the OFr. \**croule-queue* 'wagtail': a hapax found and identified in an Anglo-Norman text by Paul Meyer, cf. Oulmont, *Les débats du clerc et du chevalier*, glossary s. v. *croulecowe*; Tobler-Lommatzsch s. v. *crolecoë*; FEW s. v. *cauda* (this is to be found in the section devoted to the names of the 'wagtail,' contributed by R. Hallig who,

in his dissertation 'Die Benennungen der Bachstelze,' Leipzig 1913, did not know of the OFr. form, but mentioned a parallel Venetian *skorla-koa* = '[s]crollare' + 'coda'). The OFr. word *croule-coë* is formed on the popular pattern: imperative + nominal object; similarly, the name of the bird *motacilla* appears in academic French as *hochequeue* and in dialects as *bat-queue*, *branle-queue*, *bale-queue* etc.

While the equation 'Eng. *curlecue* = OFr. *crole-couë*' is impeccable from the phonetic point of view, for the semantic development we can only point to parallel cases. This, however, should not invalidate our equation, since so much of the OFr. word material has been lost forever (only by accident was the hapax in question brought to light). The name of the wagtail has, in all languages, been applied to the fanciful, flaunting, coquettish gait of women or youngsters, and such must have been the original implication of Eng. *curlicue* and *purlicue* in their figurative use. The idea of curves or spirals must have been secondary, and the ultimate specialization to curves and spirals in writing and to (final) flourishes, tertiary.<sup>4</sup> The names given to the wagtail, such as Valais *cova-reva* (< OFr. *rever* 'aller çà et là pour son plaisir, rôder, faire la débauche, faire une promenade joyeuse'), Central Fr. *balle-queue* (literally: 'dance, oh tail!'), Ital. *ballerina*, Western Fr. *marionnette* indicate that the up-and-down movement of the bird's movement was freely interpreted: the to-and-fro rhythm could be expanded into zigzagging, dancing, pirouetting etc. The closest parallel to *crolecoë* 'wagtail' > *curlicue* 'spiral' seems to me to be Poitevin *biscouette* (*bascouette*), Prov. *biscouó* 'wagtail' (forms, in both cases, which have been altered from \**bat-couette* under the influence of *bas*, *baissier*, *bis*-) which developed into: Saintonge *faire en biscouets* 'marcher en zigzag,' Prov. *biscouado* 'crochet que fait une monture en courant,' 'équipée, sottise, maladresse, en Guienne et Limousin.' Perhaps the Eng. verb *to curlicue* preceded

<sup>4</sup> This shift is the reverse of the one seen in *to flourish* 'to adorn [with florid designs] in writing' > 'to swing about flauntingly, to brandish.'—The dialectal meaning attested by Wright for *purlicue*: 'the space enclosed by the extended forefinger and thumb' must be derived from 'the space enclosed by the up-and-down movement of the wagtail.'—As for parallels of words for fanciful writing drawn from the animal realm, cf. It. *ghiribizzo* (< Germ. *krebs* 'crawfish'), *sgorbio* (< Lt. *scorpio*), Fr. *pattes d'araignée* etc.

the noun: it would correspond to a Fr. *\*croule-queuer*. As for the English form *purlicue*, I would admit the influence (on *curlicue*) either of Eng. *to purl* (*pirli*) 'to whirl, to spin around' or of the French word-family *pirouetter*, Poitevin *vir[c]ouetter* 'pirouetter,' Anjou *pirli* 'pirouette' etc.—which I shall treat below in connection with Eng. *pilliwinks*. The word *curlicue* which expresses a rather capricious manner of writing is likely to change 'capriciously,' it can not be anchored as firmly in the language as other less 'fanciful' words. Melville in his *Moby Dick* (ch. 99) has a mate use the form *curvicue* (= *curlicue* + *curve*).

4. DUDGEON. In the NED we find the following information under the words *dudgeon sb.* 1, *dudgeon sb.* 2 and *a.*, *endugine sb.*, *dudgin sb.* and *a.*

*Dudgeon sb.* 1 "a kind of wood used by turners, esp. for handles of knives, daggers, etc., the hilt of a dagger made of this wood." First attested in Anglo-French texts: 1380 'Que nulles manches darbre forsque *digeon* soyent colurez,' 1439 'de j dagger, cum manubrio de *doggon*,' from 1440 as *dojoun*, *dogeon*, *dogen*, *dugion* in English texts. One has supposed that the wood in question is that of the boxtree. "The form of the word suggests a French origin; but no corresp. word has been found in continental French."

*Dudgeon sb.* 2 and *a.* "a feeling of anger, resentment, or offence; ill humour. Almost always in phr. in *dudgeon*, and esp. with qualifying adj., as 'high, great, deep'" (1573 Harvey: 'Who seem'd to take it in marvelous great *duggon*'), "resentful, spiteful, ill-humored" (1589 'If such a one doo but nod, it is right *dudgin* and deepe discretion,' 1599: 'in such *dudgeon* scorn'). "Origin unknown; identical in form with prec., so far as is known, no connexion of sense. Cf. *endugine*" (1638 'taking in great *endugine*').

*Dudgin sb.* and *a.* "poor stuff, trash" (1592 'the stalest *dudgen* or absurd balductum that they . . . can invent'), "mean, poor, contemptible" (1589 'a *dudgen* destination'), "ordinary, homely" (1613 'plain and *dudgeon*'). "Perhaps the same as *dudgeon sb.* 1; a dagger with a handle of this material being cheap and often regarded as an inferior and unreliable weapon; cf. quotes. 1581 ['your *doodgean* dagger eloquence'] and 1590 ['loose in the haft like a *dudgin* dagger'] in *Dudgeon sb.* 1."

As etymon of this word (for all the forms listed above represent, in my opinion, only one word) I propose a Fr. *digeon* which is attested in 1828 as the name of the 'whew,' the 'canard siffleur' (*avis penelope*) in Anjou, by Paul Barbier fils,<sup>5</sup> *Rev. de lingu. rom.*

<sup>5</sup> P. Barbier had made his inquiry at the behest of Prof. Onions, who

1, 325 (cf. also *dijon digeon* in Verrier-Onillon's dictionary of Anjou s. v. *canard*). Since the main characteristic of this bird is its whistle (cf. the German name *Pfeifente*, as well as the Eng. *whew*), and since its parallel denominations clearly show French etyma of an onomatopoeic origin (Eng. *widgeon*, *wigeon*, probably based upon a French word; Fr. *vi(u)geon*, Antilles Fr. *gingeon*), Barbier reconstructs a *\*diu-io(-onis)*, i. e. an onomatopoeic stem *\*diu-* parallel to the Romance *\*piu- \*wiu- \*miu-* stems + the suffix *-io* of Lat. *plumbio* > *plongeon*, Lat. *pipio* etc. Barbier was able to base himself, for his *\*diu-io*, *\*viu-io* only on the modern Anjou form: "Mon explication des noms de canards *vigeon*, *digeon* etc., présuppose évidemment l'ancienneté de ces noms. Elle présuppose, en d'autres termes, que ces noms remontent jusqu'à l'époque latine. . . . Ce qui constitue la grosse difficulté pour l'étymologiste qui s'occupe de ces mots, c'est l'absence presque totale de textes anciens." But perhaps our Eng. words can bridge, to a certain extent, the historical gap. If we suppose that a *\*digeonner* verb, derived from *digeon*, meant 'to whistle,' we could explain the *dudgeon dagger* or *knife* (attested in the 14<sup>th</sup> c.) as a tool making a rattling sound (because the hilt is not firmly attached to the blade), hence the meaning 'made of cheap material,' 'cheap, poor.' The phrases *to take something in [high] dudgeon* (attested in the 16<sup>th</sup> c.) could again mean '... with a high-pitched whistle' = 'in a strident ill humor,' cf. the parallel Eng. *whew* (= onomat. *\*viu*) 'exclamation of the nature of a whistle uttered by a person as a sign of astonishment, disgust, dismay etc. (e. g. the passage quoted in the NED from Shakespeare's *Henry IV*)—*whewer* 'the female of the widgeon.' Finally, dialectal Eng. (Wright) *humdudgeon* 'needless noise or fuss, a complaint without reason,' also 'a big, stupid person of evil disposition' (cf. the similar meaning of *widgeon*), testifies for *-dudgeon* as originally denoting a sound.

5. PILLIWINKS 'an instrument of torture for squeezing the fingers; supposed to resemble the thumbkins or thumbscrew.' On the etymology of this word the NED states:

In English use, c. 1400, *pyrwikes*, *pyrewinkes*. In Scottish use, c. 1600, *pilliwinkes* and *pinniwinkis*; corrupted by later historical or antiquarian

inserted his finds in the article *widgeon* of the NED. — The word *widget* which I have seen in print coupled with *gremlin* must be a derivative of *widgeon*.

writers, . . . to *pinnewinks*, *pinnywinkles*, *pirlewinkles*, etc. Origin unknown: the 15<sup>th</sup> c. Eng. *pyrewinkes* coincides with a contemporary spelling of *periwinkle* (the flower); but there is no obvious connexion of sense. The early forms do not agree . . . with those of *periwinkle* the shellfish, the forms in *-winkle* being merely later corruptions after the word had become obsolete soon after 1600.

It is evident that this 1400 Anglo-French word (cf. the text of 1397 cited by the NED) is the same as mod. Prov. (Provence, Quercy) *pelinqueto*, *pirlinqueto* 'spinning top' listed by Mistral, *perinkle* 'spinning top' in point 645 (Guyenne) of the map 'toupie' of the *Atlas linguistique*—and that this, in turn, must be related to the French word family of *pirouette*. In regard to this word family, three scholars have expressed their opinion: Horning, *ZRPh* xxii, 561; Haust, *Etymologies wallonnes et françaises*, p. 295 and Sainéan, *Sources indigènes de l'étym. fr.* i, 83.

Horning sees in *pirouette* a variant of that O. Norm. *wirewite* (*wirewire*, *werwite*, *virevite*) which is at the basis of mod. Fr. *girouette* 'weather-vane,' and in which Thomas, *Essais de phil. fr.* had recognized on O. Norse *wedhrviti* 'indication of weather' 'weather-vane' (REW 9516). In order to prove the identity of *virevite* with *pirouette*, Horning lists the following dialectal words:

Ille-et-Vilaine *pirvire* 'bouton de bois traversé par une cheville qu'on fait tourner avec le pouce'

Lorrain *pirwil* 'Knöpfe aus Holz, die, mit Tuch bedeckt, in drehende Bewegung gebracht und als Kinderspielzeug benutzt werden'

St. Hubert, Wallonie *pèrwi* 'toupie, sabot'

Meuse *piroile* 'gros sou avec lequel on joue au patard au jeu du bouchon'

Norm. *perrouette* 'fille évaporée'

and compares to Fr. *pirout* 'petit disque que traverse un pivot, sur lequel on le fait tourner en lui donnant une impulsion, toton' (attested in Gréban, 15<sup>th</sup> cent.: *Dict. gén.*) and to OF. *pirouette* 'sorte de moulin, joyau en forme de petit moulin à vent' (attested in the 16<sup>th</sup> cent.), the use of *virevite* in the phrase *ce moulinet qui sert de virevite* (*Mystere de l'Incarnation*, 1474). Horning thinks

\* For a possible connection between this word and Fr. *péringle* 'wagtail' (Buffon: *peringles*), cf. R. Hallig, *Die Benennungen der Bachstelze*, diss. Leipzig 1923, p. 36: 'the bird that rotates.'



of a dissimilation *virevite* > \**pirevite* (> *pirouette*), comparable to *pirevollet* in Rabelais 'spinning top' from *virevoler* 'tourner en rond,' Meuse *violet* 'feu follet.'

Haust compares *pirouette* with St. Hubert *pèrwi* etc., Walloon forms of the type *pirwitche* 'totum' 'pirouette' and, in the patois of Burdinne, *spèrwitche*: the latter reveals to him the (Germanic) origin of the whole family: Aachen *spirewippche* 'totum' (*spire* 'a pointed thing' + *wipp* 'a quick movement').<sup>7</sup>

Finally, Sainéan compares to *pirouette* the Haute-Bretagne *piroton* 'young goose' and *pirotonner* 'to whirl around'; he explains the names (listed below) of games with whirling objects (totum, spinning top, a little stick which is made to whirl by being hit by a larger one) from the rotary movement, the 'pirouetting,' characteristic of young geese—*pirou* being the word for the cry of the goose, which also serves as the name of the fowl itself, according to Cotgrave and Nicot. The names of games given by Sainéan are: Norm. *piroue* 'spinning top,' Guernsey 'rouelle, petit jouet d'enfant qu'on fait tourner sur un pied ou pivot'; Yonne *pirouelle* 'totum,' Clairvaux 'spinning top.' We may also remember the *pirouet* 'totum' in the *Passion* of Gréban, and the *pirouette* 'joyau en forme de moulinet' mentioned by Horning; Sainéan also mentions a *pirouette* used by Rabelais in reference to the games of young Gargantua; he interprets this as a 'bâton qu'on fait pirouetter en l'air en le frappant avec un bâton.' The *pirevollet* of the Rabelaisian list is also mentioned here: *pirvoller* 'être projeté très loin, passer en volant, en tournoyant, en parlant d'un objet lancé' is given for Anjou by Verrier-Onillon; Sainéan mentions in this connection Morvan *pirevole* 'coccinelle,' literally 'little flying hen or goose.' Finally, there is a reference to *pirouy* (16<sup>th</sup> cent.), the name of a lively dance.

Of these three theories that of Haust seems to me the least defensible: how would it have been possible for a local Rhenanian term to have penetrated, as early as the 15<sup>th</sup> or 16<sup>th</sup> century, as far into Central France as would appear to be the case according to our attestations? We may rather assume that Germ. *spirewippche* was able to influence the local Walloon forms of the (more widespread) *pirouette* type. It is probable that the *verwire* 'somer-

<sup>7</sup> On page 303 he mentions separately a Montbéliard (Doubs) *pilegati*, *pirgati* 'somersault' which should also, I believe, be referred to *pirouette* (\**pirouatte*).



sault' mentioned by Haust on p. 299 as independent from the *pirouet* family is equivalent to Horning's *pirvire* 'bouton de bois.' Sainéan's theory, while it fails to solve the whole question (Horning's contributions are not taken into consideration), does, nevertheless, offer a clue, in my opinion, to the 'why' of the 'dissimilation' assumed by Horning: a *pirouette* from \**virouette* (*virevite*), and a *pirvoler* from *virvoler* (< \**vire-voler*) came into existence as a result of an influence of *pirou* 'goose,' *pirotonner* 'to pirouette like a young goose.'

Horning's theory seems to me to be basically sound: *pirouette*, in its reference both to different games involving 'whirling' and to 'pirouetting,' must be derived from \**virouette* (*virevite*) 'weather-vane.' Probably the French felt \**virouette* to be in a relationship (historically impossible) with the verb *virer* (attested since the 12<sup>th</sup> cent., of unknown origin), as is shown by the 15-16<sup>th</sup> cent. form *virevouste* (18<sup>th</sup> cent. *virevousse*) which, under the influence of It. *giravolta*, or by contamination with Fr. \**vire-voler*, became *virevo(u)lte* in the 16<sup>th</sup> century; compare also Poitevin *vireoutter*, *virevouster*, *vircouetter* 'pirouetter, virer, aller en tournant' (Favre). Thus, under the influence of the *pire* '(whirling) goose' family, a parallelism of *vir-* and *pir-* forms was established, of which I see traces in the Anjou *pirvoler* mentioned above ~ *virevoler*, and in Anjou *pirli* 'branche de 0<sup>m</sup> 10 aiguisée aux deux bouts, qu'on fait pirouetter avec une branche de 0<sup>m</sup> 50' (Verrier-Onillon) ~ OF. *vireli* (13<sup>th</sup> cent.), *virelai* (14<sup>th</sup> cent.) 'danse, refrain' (from *virer*, Dauzat).

None of the three scholars speaks of the Prov. *pirlinqueto* *perinkle* forms—and, of course, the same is true of the English forms *pyrewikes*, *pyrewinkes*, both of which series must go back to a \**pirouique* with the suffix *-ic-* (as in Fr. *tourn-iqu-et*) appended to the stem *pirou-*. The English word must have first meant 'whirligig, wheel,' from which we may infer that the instrument of torture by which the thumbs of delinquents were squeezed, must have been a wheel: *Wörter* sometimes cast a light on *Sachen*. As so often happens, our English words are the earliest attestations (14<sup>th</sup> century) of the Fr. *pirouette* group which appears in French literature about 50 years later (in Gréban's *Passion*, concluded c. 1452).

In view of the French names of children's games which are derived from the *pirouette* word-family, as we have listed them above, it may not appear too bold to assume a connection between the Eng.

*tiddlywinks* 'a game in which one tries to throw small disks into a small cup' with the medieval *pilliwinks*. The NED s. v. *tiddlywink* lists the following meanings:

1. 'an unlicensed public house or pawnshop; a small beershop' (also *kiddlywink*), attested since 1844;
- 2a. 'a game played with dominoes,' b. *pl.* 'a game in which small counters are caused to spring from the table into a bell-like or cylindrical receptacle, by pressing upon their edges with larger counters,' attested since 1870;
3. *pl.* 'knick-knacks of victuals,' attested since 1893.

And we find the meanings s. v. *tiddlywinking* 'trifling, puttering' (1869), *tiddlywinky* 'tiny, insignificant' (1901), *tiddlywinker* 'a cheat, a trifler'; in his *Dict. of Slang* Partridge adds *tiddlywing* 'a sickly, very thin child' [1823], to *tiddlywink* 'to spend imprudently or with unsanctioned excess' [Australian, 1888]. As for the etymology, the NED seems to consider a compound of *wink* with the slang expression *tiddly* 'a drink, drunk' (meaning 1), and with *tiddy*, dialectal or baby-talk for 'little.' I would rather propose the *influence* of the last two words on *pillywinks* in its original meaning of a child's game, analogous to the French *pirouette* words: from the meaning 'a child's game' there developed the meaning 'trifles,' hence 'knick-knacks,' 'a place where cheap food is offered or cheap wares are pawned' etc.

6. PROWL. On the etymology of this word the NED remarks as follows: "ME. *proll-en*, origin unknown; there is app. no related word outside of English. The change to *proul*, *prowl* was at first merely one of spelling (cf. *Bowl* sb.<sup>1</sup>), but has since c 1760 perverted the pronunciation from (prol pro<sup>u</sup>l) to (praul)." Along with the form *proll-en* (attested 1388 with Chaucer: 'Though ye *prolle* aye, ye shul it neuere fynde') we find a form *pralle* (1460 in J. Russell: *to pralle for a flesche mought* 'to search, seek for'). Skeat sought the etymon in an iterative \**progle* from *prog*, Weekley in an hypothetical OF. \**por-rouler*.

There is an entry in Palsgrave (1530): 'I *prolle*, I go here and there to seke a thyng, *Je tracasse*' which shows that the original meaning was 'to move about,' without the modern implications 'in search of plunder, prey etc., or with predatory intent,' said chiefly of wild beasts, or of men acting like them. On the contrary,

I believe our verb was first used of domesticated animals—if I am right in connecting it with the word family listed in REW svv. *protelum* 'Deichsel' = 'beam pole' and *\*protelaria* 'Kette, mit der die Ochsen an die Deichsel gebunden werden' ('chain by which the oxen are tied to the beam'); "... it. *trapelo* 'Vorspannpferd,' lim. *prodial* (< afr. *prodeau*), anj. *proueil*, ... afr. *proix* 'Verlängerung der Deichsel'; "Piem. *pruvei* 'Pflugkette,' afrz. *proliere*, heute bourn. *prolir*."

According to this we would have an OF. *\*prœil*, *\*pro(i)l* (< *protelum*, *\*protel-*) 'lengthening piece, cord, chain or pole which serves to harness additional animals to those pulling a plough, a cart etc. for reinforcement when a particularly difficult job has to be done'; this word is attested in the form *proix* as late as 1455 (Gode.), but the derivative *proliere* 'corde, trait' (1352), *prolet* 'licol' (1340) etc., as well as the parallel offered by It. *trapelo* -are and the Provençal forms, help to establish a genuine OF. word family *\*pro(i)l*. Now, anyone who has seen oxen or horses hitched on loosely to a team, will have observed that they 'move around' and do not simply go straight ahead in the direction intended by the teamster; they are animals 'on the prowl' in the original meaning, i. e. roving around. The secondary development 'in search of something' is quite independent from the first image, and offers a parallel to that which took place with 'search' itself: OF. *cerchier* < *circare* 'to go around, to move around.' Although the OF. verb is unattested (in contrast to It. *trapelare*), we must assume, because of the tonic vowel (-o-, not -oi-), that an OF. *\*proler* (< *\*protelare*, cf. *protelaria* < *proliere*) was in existence. The form *pralle* may be explained from a Fr. *\*pral*, with the reduction of the diphthong *oi* to *a* as in Fr. *carcasse* < OF. *carcois*, *gravat* < OF. *gravoî*.

7. TANTRUM(s) and DOLDRUMS. a. TANTRUMS. This word, in the modern meaning 'an outburst of petulance or ill-temper; a fit of passion. Mostly in *pl.*', is attested since 1748, according to the NED, which declares the etymology unknown, but adds the remark: "In Wallis's *Room For The Cobbler of Gloucester* (1668) 4, *tantrum* appears as a Welshman's mispronunciation of *anthem*, but apparently has no connexion with this word." On the contrary, I believe this fact to be highly significant; why, indeed, should not *tantrum(s)* be a general (not only a Welsh) popular alteration of

*anthem*? If we think of cases such as OF. *ante* (> Eng. *aunt*) > mod. Fr. *tante* (and the parallel *oncle* > dial. Fr. *konk*), or ME. *affodil* (< *afrodille* < Lat. *asphodelos*) > mod. Eng. *daffodil*, Eng. *undern* > dial. *downdrinsch*, then *t)antrum* from an *\*antrum* becomes plausible. This *\*antrum* is confirmed by the dial. Eng. forms *antrims*, *antrums*, *antherums* 'airs, whims, caprices, with an implication of temper,' 'doubts, hesitations,' listed by Wright (with the remark: "Etym. unknown. See *Tantrums*"), and must correspond to the *antym* forms of *anthem* in Chaucer (variant *antheme*) and in *Prompt. Parv.*: the *antherums* of dial. English already reflects the *th-* pronunciation of *anthem*, which is secondary (cf. *Anthony*, *author* etc.). The insertion of the *-r-* in a word borrowed from French, as is *anthem* (< *antienne* 'antiphon'), is, in itself, no more astounding than is the same insertion in OF. *contek* > Eng. *cantankerous* (MLN. LIX, 223), OF. *boisd-ie* > Eng. *boisterous* (Rom. XXXII, 148); in our word, the *-r-* may also be due to the influence of *doldrum(s)* where, as I shall show, the *-r-* is probably genuine.

It has not hitherto been observed that the *\*antrum* = *antim* 'anthem,' a form based on the dialectal *antrim* *antrum* and on *tantrum*, may also be at the bottom of the word *humdrum*, attested first in 1533 in the modern meaning 'lacking variety, of a routine character, commonplace, monotonous, dull,' and the etymology of which, according to the NED, is: "app. a reduplicating form from *Hum* v.; it is doubtful whether the second element had any distinct connexion with *Drum* sb." — the NED is fond of assuming compounds when, in reality, there is one French simplex at the bottom of a word. If we observe that the first attestation of *humdrum* shows the form *humtrum* (*pe* old accustomed *humtrum* *distinccion*), we are led away from *drum* toward our *\*antrum*, which must have later acquired the *h-* of vulgar parlance,<sup>a</sup> and in which the first part of the word must have been assimilated to the second: *\*h)antrum* > *humtrum* (cf. the same procedure in the case of the first *t-* of *t)antrum*, and the first *-r-* of *caterpillar* = *\*chatte peleure* > *\*chatre peleure*). As for *-tr-* > *-dr-* in *humtrum* > *humdrum*, cf. *-rt-* > *-rd-* in such examples as *carte* > *card*, *jeu parti* > *jeopardy*. In regard to the semantic aspect, both meanings 'old,

<sup>a</sup> An early example of this adventitious *h-* is ME. *haberdine* 'codfish' (attested in 1370 as *haburdenne*) < Fr. *\*l)abourdain*, from the name *Le Labourd*.

monotonous' and 'outbursts of ill-temper' can be justified: on the one hand we find such expressions as pop. Fr. *chanter toujours la même antienne* 'répéter toujours la même chose,' Saintonge *antienne* 'longue attente, temps perdu avec ennui' (cf. Prov. *antifoni* 'antienne; vieillerie, vieux meuble'); 16<sup>th</sup> cent. Fr.: 'Vous nous cornés sempiternellement vostre succession, institution et substitution et ne nous chantez jamais autres letanies, sequences ny antiphones,' Huguet; Ital. *ripetere la stessa antifona* (for an explanation of the impression of repetitiousness in the antiphons, cf. Rheinfelder, *Kultsprache und Profansprache*, p. 370). On the other hand, we may compare Fr. *chanter une antienne à quelqu'un* 'pour lui annoncer quelque mauvaise nouvelle; lui faire de vifs reproches; le gronder, le vespériser,' D'Hautel, *Dict. du bas-langage*, 1808)—this *vespériser* 'to taunt' is a good parallel to *chanter une antienne à qqn* 'to lecture, to preach at someone,' as is also the It. *cantare il matuttino ad alc.* (cf. Germ. *jem. die Leviten lesen* etc.). From 'to taunt sb. angrily' it is not far to 'to have an outburst of ill-temper'; one may note the plural *tantrums, antrims*, as a continuation of the plural in (*chanter*) *antiennes*.

The form of the English suffix *-em* (*anthem*) *-im -um* (*antrim -um*) corresponds to *-ene*: we must start, as the NED says, from OF. *antoine* (< Greco-Latin *antiphona*),<sup>9</sup> in which *oi* became *ai* (pronounced *e*): this latter form is reflected in Old French by an *antesne* (evidently with muted *-s*) in G. de Coincy (13<sup>th</sup> cent.), and in a 15<sup>th</sup> cent. *antaine* (cf. the English spelling of a 13-14<sup>th</sup> cent. text: *antayn*). Parallels to Fr. *-ene, -aine* > Eng. *-um -im* are *calembredaine* > *conundrum*, *migraine* > *megrim*. These 'wrong' *m*'s (instead of the correct *-n-* as in *mitten -on* < Fr. *mitaine*)<sup>10</sup> seem to me to go back to a time when French intervocalic *-n-* still produced the nasalization of the preceding vowel, i. e. when *-aine* was still pronounced *-aïne* (as it is still pronounced today in many French patois where the ulterior standard French denasalization has not yet taken place): at that time (after the final vowel had been dropped in Anglo Norman, and *-aine* was on the same level with *-(a)in*; cf. *sexton* < *sacristain*, *venom* < *venin*) it was possible for an *-ain'* cluster, which could come either from an *a + n*

<sup>9</sup> This *antiphona* is more faithful to Greek, while OF. *antie(f)ne* goes back to a semi-Latinized *ante-phona* (FEW).

<sup>10</sup> An influence from *sophom-um* 'sophism' (< Fr. *sophisme* with muted *-s*) is not excluded.



or from an *a + m*, (*plain* < *planus*, *pelain* < \**pellamen*), to be misinterpreted, 'mis-etymologized,' as containing an *-m* instead of the correct *-n*. Thus the false English reconstruction *-m* in our *-um -im -em* words is a reminder of the nasalized form of an OF. *ant(i)ên(e* which preceded the denasalized mod. Fr. form *antienne*.

b. **DOLDRUM(s)**. The NED says of this word: "app. in its origin a slang term, prob. a deriv. of prec. [*dold* 'dull, stupid, foolish'] or of *dol*, Dull. For the form cf. *tantrum*." In slang the word is first attested 1812 in the meaning 'a dullard; a dull, drowsy, or sluggish fellow'; *the doldrums* is attested in 1811 (evidently not in slang) in the meaning 'a condition of dullness or drowsiness; dumps, low spirits, depression,' in 1824 in the meaning 'the condition of a ship in which, either from calms, or from baffling winds, she makes no headway,' and, finally, in 1855, apparently as a result of a misunderstanding of the phrase 'in the doldrums' whereby the state was taken as a locality, in the meaning 'the regions of the *Equatorial doldrums*.'

The suffix *-rum*, however, is not cleared up by the reference to *tantrum(s)* 'an outburst of petulance or ill-temper, a fit of passion,' since the etymology of *tantrum* is unknown to the NED (see above). Wright's *Eng. Dialect Dict.* shows a wider semantic range for *doldrum(s)* than is indicated in the dictionaries of standard English:

1. 'mental disturbance, an excited condition' [variant *dildrams*]
2. 'low spirits combined with ill-humour'
3. 'giddiness in the head'
4. 'the death pang'
5. 'anything of a large size' (*a doldrum o' a steen*), probably originally 'an incredible story.'
6. in the phrase *to tell doldrums* 'to tell improbable stories' [variant *dildrams*]
7. adj. 'confused, stupid,' hence *doldrumish* 'of an old house: rambling'

In addition to the variant *dildrams*, already mentioned, we find also *dildam* 'a loud noise made at a wedding or merry-making,' *dandrum* 'a whim, a freak; ill-temper,' *dulderdum* 'confused, in a state of stupor; silenced by argument.' Given the obvious etymological identity existing between dial. Eng. *dandril* 'a knock, a blow; a curved stick with which hockey is played' (Wright) and a French *dandrille* attested by Cotgrave 'the rag or clout wherewith a leak-



ing tub is stopped, also a man's privies; or that which hangs dangling between his legs,' which in turn must be connected with the onomatopoeic Fr. root *dand- dond-* 'to dangle, to give a blow'—and given also the reductibility of the Eng. ending *-um* to Fr. *-aine -in* (cf. Fr. *calembredaine* > *conundrum*, Fr. *venin* > Eng. *venom* etc.), we are led from our Eng. *doldrum dild(r)am dandrum dulderdum* to a dialectal Fr. *\*dond(r)ain(e) dand(r)-ain(e)*. We must not, of course, expect to find all the meanings of the English dialectal words represented in any one attested French dialectal word; rather must we compare the Eng. *word family* to the Fr. *word family*. Evidently, the *dond- dand-* family, used of dangling bells, of raining blows etc. came to refer to mental instability, hesitation, giddiness, wavering, confusion, stupidity, caprice, whimsicality, ill-humour, insincerity: let us consider, out of the wealth of words listed by the FEW s. vv. *dand- dond-*, just the following, which are semantically parallel to the English words:

- Blois *dondrille* 'vibration de l'air chaud qui monte'<sup>10</sup>  
 Bléré *dondaine* 'colère'  
 Giv. *dondinne* 'qui n'a pas son bon sens; plur. caprices'  
 St. Etienne *danderliner* 'agir nonchalamment'  
 Clairvaux *dandainnes* 'racontars de peu de valeur; grivoiseries, men-songes' [variant *tantainnes*]  
 Ht.-Maine *dandilleux* 'incertain, présentant quelque danger'  
 Bas-Maine " 'chatouilleux, difficile, scabreux'  
 Poit. *être donde* 'épuisé' (this is taken from Favre)

The *-l-* of *dild(r)ams doldrums* may be due to a dissimilation of *dandrum* (< *\*dandraine*): *n - n* > *l - n*; it may, however, also be explained from *dandril* > *dandrille* with metathesis. Moreover, there is undeniably the influence of *tantrum(s)* at work here—a word, as we have tried to show, of a quite different origin.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Could *dandruff-iff* (attested since 1545, etymologically not yet classified) be a derivative from *\*dondr-* in the meaning 'things of no value,' 'refuse' (with an ending like in mod. Fr. *dandeste* 'sling,' *dandifler* 'to know' (which FEW s. v. *fundibulus* considers as *fundebalus* + *\*dond-*) or like in Eng. *rifraff*?

<sup>11</sup> In the case of *tantrum(s)* I would not attach any importance to the Fr. dial. variant *tantainnes* that we found along with *dandainnes*. We may, however, see in the plural of *doldrums* an influence of *tantrums* (< *antiennes*).

8. VAGARY. This word, which originally meant 'an excursion, ramble, stroll,' is first attested in 1577; in the 17<sup>th</sup> century the phrases *to fetch, make, take a vagary* were frequent; *to play his vagary* was said in 1580 of a horse that refused to follow the desired course. Skeat and the NED connect it with the Lat. *vagari*, the first comparing the use of (French) infinitives as nouns, as illustrated by *remainder, attainder, leisure, pleasure*. But how should we justify the preservation of a *Latin* infinitive? There is nothing to indicate, for example, that *vagari* was used in students' slang (as we find e. g. *grassatim ire* in the slang of German students). It seems clear to me that we must abandon such an ostensibly simple explanation for one more complicated, if we take into account the article *fegary* in the NED; this word which, with its variants *fagarie, figary, fleegerie, f(l)eegary*, is attested from 1600 on in the meaning 'a vagary, prank, freak; a whim, eccentricity,' is considered by the NED as an alteration of *vagary*. But it is more probable that it is the complicated forms which are closest to the etymon—at any rate, we are given no indication of the influences by which a *vagary* (< Lat. *vagari*) could become *f(l)ag-ary*.

The most complicated variants, however, appear not in standard English but in the dialects: Wright lists such forms as *fligma(e)ary, flegm-, flegmaleeries*. It is no chance that the longest forms show meanings which are closer to the primitive status of the word: in addition to 'whim, fancy' we find such meanings as 'a gaudy, useless article of dress, frippery' and 'a tawdrily-dressed woman' (cf. also *fligary* 'finely dressed, a gaudily-dressed girl,' Wright).

Thus I propose to start from the type *fligmagary*, where it is possible to recognize something resembling Fr. *flamenguerie* 'the attitude, doings, character of a Fleming,' from *Flamand, flamin-gant*, OF. (*drap*) *flamenc* 'sorte d'étoffe de Flandre' = Germ. *flaming* 'Flemish' (FEW). As appears from the other ethnic designation *flandrin* 'sobriquet pour dire niais, sot, ignorant, stupide, fainéant, rôdeur, paresseux' (FEW s.v. *Flandern*), the French have seen in the Flemish their slovenly attitude. Now, it so happened that the name of the 'flamingo' (derived from *flamma* because of the red feathers of this bird) came to be confused with the word designating the Flemish: Anjou *flamand* 'flandrin, hallebreda, individu grand, fluët et dégingandé' is explained by Verrier-Onillon from *flamand* 'Flemish,' and by von Wartburg from

*flamant* 'flamingo.' Sainéan (*Les sources indigènes de l'étym. fr.* II, 369) gives the following description of the bird in question: "Son petit corps repose sur des jambes longues de près d'un mètre et sa démarche est lente, irrégulière et quelque peu vacillante," and he believes that the ethnicon is only secondary in the semantic expansion—an opinion opposed by von Wartburg. But, whether we start from *flaming* 'flemish' or from *\*flamm-ing* 'flamingo,' it is possible to explain the meanings 'tawdriness,' 'eccentricity' of the English words, from the meanings of the existing French words. The preservation of the *-g-* of the suffix (instead of a change to *-ant* as in standard French), would suggest a dialectal origin (Picardian, Normandian, Provençal). Mistral lists Prov. *flamen* 'indolent, lendore,' *long flamen* 'gran flandrin,' *uno flamenco* 'une femme paresseuse et molle, à Béziers,' and an abstract noun *flamen-carié* 'indolence, paresse, lenteur, long récit, langage affecté, mi-gnardise,' which would correspond to our assumed Fr. *\*flamenguerie*. If the spelling *fligmageary* be taken as indicating a *ž*-pronunciation, we may assume a *\*flamengerie* and have recourse to OF. *flamange*, *flamenge*, feminine forms of *flamenc*, or to other *ž*-forms listed by Godefroy and the FEW; indeed, our constructed word *Flamengerie* actually occurs in Froissard as the name of Flanders. Even without admitting a *ž*-pronunciation with the English dialectal word, we could assume a substitution of sounds such as *Flamengerie* > *fle(g)magary*—cf. *\*escoulourgerie* > *sculduggery* [and *sculduddery*].

If *fligmagary* is really a *\*flamengu-erie*, the first *g* must be the result of an assimilation to the second. As is always the case with such fanciful words borrowed from French (cf. *calembredaine* > *conundrum*), the phonetic instability would be due not only to the fact of the borrowing itself, but also to a kind of popular symbolism: the whimsicality of the semantic content entails whimsicality of phonetic form. A *fligmagary* could thus be reduced to *fligary*, then to *fegary*, and finally, under the influence of *vagabond*, *vagrant*, it could become *vagary*. The suffix *-ary* is evidently of a secondary nature in English, cf. *quandary* from *quorundum* (< *calembredaine*, cf. *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* XLII, 405). A form such as *fleegerie* gives a more faithful reflection of the suffix form of *\*flameng(u)-erie*.

LEO SPITZER

*The Johns Hopkins University*

OLD FRENCH *RAQUEER*, *RECOIER*, *RECOI*

W. Meyer-Lübke in the first edition of the REW (1911), no. 7234, explains the Old French noun *recoi* 'verborgener Ort' which appears so often in the texts, as a popular development of VL \**requētus* (CL *requiētus*) and this etymology was for a number of years considered to be entirely satisfactory.<sup>1</sup> The third edition of the REW (1935) has, however, dropped out no. 7234 (\**requētus*) and we now find *recoi* listed under no. 6958 (*quiētus*, *quētus*). Meyer-Lübke was probably prompted to make the change because he found *requiētus* represented nowhere else in Romance. He has followed the suggestion of Moritz Regula who had proposed a revision of article 7234 of the first edition of the REW.<sup>2</sup> Regula says with regard to *recoi*: Afrz. *recoi* ist wohl eher Neubildung nach den gleichbedeutenden Verbalsubstantiven *refui*, *repaire*, *repos*, *reculet* (~ *anglet*), *retrait* (= \**retractus*; vgl. *recessus* > valenc. *raçes*), *receptus* > prov. *recet*. The history of OF *recoi* is somewhat complicated but it will appear, as we trace it in detail, that Meyer-Lübke was nearer the truth when he connected it with VL \**requētus* in the first edition of the REW.

An examination of an OF verb *raqueer*, *recoier*, listed as two separate words by Godefroy, will be of help in explaining *recoi*. No one has ever, as far as I can learn, proposed an etymology of OF *raqueer*, *recoier*. Godefroy (VL, 603c) gives two examples of *raqueer* both from *Doon de Maience* (13th c.):

- 1) 5417 Quant ot tant doulousé, si s'ala *raqueant*
- 2) 5062 Et quant il ot cheu dit, es les vous *raqueés*

It is evident from the context in each case<sup>3</sup> that Godefroy's translations are exact: 1) *raqueer* (*se*) v. refl., s'apaiser, se calmer 2) *raqueé*, part. passé, apaisé, calmé. OF *raqueer* represents a VL \**requētare* formed on the past participle of CL *requiescere*. As is well known VL possessed such forms as *quetus*, *quescere* for CL *quietus*, *quiescere*. The formation of a verb on the past participle

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Dictionnaire général*: du lat. populaire \**rēquētum* (class. *rēquīētum*); E. Gamillscheg, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der Französischen Sprache*, Heidelberg, 1928, 747a: *recoi* . . . aus lat. *requiētus* 'ausgeruht,' referring to REW 7234.

<sup>2</sup> *Zeits. f. rom. phil.*, XLIII (1923), 130.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. M. A. Pey, *Doon de Maience*, Paris, 1859, 153, 163.

is a normal phenomenon in both Classic and Vulgar Latin. VL *\*requētare* evolved regularly into *raqueer* (*\*requeer*) with alternate prefix *ra-* for *re-*. CL *requiescere* signified 'to rest oneself, to rest, repose' and was of very common usage; CL *requiētus* (past participle) meant 'rested, refreshed.' It seems certain that *raqueer* is not a VL compound of *ra-* (*re-*) and *qu[i]etare* because this verb has left no descendents in Gallo-Romance.<sup>4</sup> The simple verb of frequent occurrence in Old French was formed on *quētus* with suffix *-iare* > *coisier* 'calmer, apaiser' (REW 6957).

Godefroy has one example of *recoier*, verbe, réfl., 'se reposer' from *La Passion Nostre Seigneur* (15th c.) It is evident, I believe, that *recoier* is a variant of *raqueer* with the stem-stressed vowel *ē* > *oi* carried over into the infinitive and forms where the *ē* was unstressed; the form in our text is *vous recoiez*. The second of the two examples of *recoier* cited by Godefroy, is from a poem of Eustache Deschamps. It is here used transitively 'garder, réserver.' Latin of the post-Augustan era employed *requiētus* in "economic language" with the sense 'that has lain or been kept for a long time' and it is evidently that shade of meaning that is reflected in *recoier* 'garder, réserver.' This is further evidence that VL *\*requētare* is the etymon of *recoier* as it is of *raqueer*. We have an echo of a wider extension of VL *\*requētare* in Italian dialectal (Bolognese) *agudars* 'sich beruhigen' (REW 7233) which has been traced by Salvioni to L. *requiētare* (= VL *\*requētare*).<sup>5</sup>

Godefroy lists *recoi* (2) as an adjective 'qui est en repos, tranquille, calme,' en parlant de personnes. The earliest example cited is from *Trubert* of Douin de l'Avesne (13th c.): Cil qui fu sages et recoiz (: *voiz*). *Recoi* adj., also applies to things in the same sense. The earliest example here is from a manuscript of the *Roman de la Rose* (13th c.): Quant je suy en.1. lieu requoy. Godefroy also lists feminine forms *requoie*, *requoyes*. The etymon is here the past participial adjective *\*requiētus* — *a* (CL *requiētus*). The formation of *re* + an adjective in Old French is practically unknown.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Cf. REW<sup>a</sup> *quiētare*, *\*quētare* > It. *chetare*, Sp. Pg. *quedar*.

<sup>5</sup> ZRP xxii (1898), 470: bol. *agudars* 'acquietarsi.' Deve aversi avuto prima un *\*argudars* = 'requietare' che forse ancora si scorge nell' *arg-di argutirs* 'rannichiarsi.'

<sup>6</sup> K. Nyrop, *Grammaire historique de la langue française*, III (1908), p. 224, § 490: "*rebours* et *recoi* ne sont pas des créations nouvelles; ils

Under *recoi*, the noun (s.m.), Godefroy notes a sense 'calme, repos, tranquillité.' It is evidently a verbal noun formed on the verb *recoier* (< \**requētare*) 'se reposer.' The earliest example is from the *Chroniques* of Enguerrand de Monstrelet (15th c.). The first meaning of *recoi* the noun, in Godefroy is 'endroit retiré, cachette, abri, refuge, lieu de retraite pour les hommes et pour les animaux,' and here the earliest example is from the 12th century *Voyage de Charlemagne à Constantinople: requēit*.<sup>7</sup> This spelling (cf. also *rekeiz*, *recot*) seems to indicate that the noun *recoi* 'endroit retiré' has grown out of its use as an adjective (\**requētus*), even although the latter is actually attested later (13th c.). The uses of the adjective in the following texts cited by Godefroy give a clue to the semantic development of the noun:

- 1) Quant je suy en .l. lieu *requoy*  
(ms. of the *Roman de la Rose*)
- 2) Venus aime les nuits sombres,  
Les lieux *recois* et les ombres  
Des taillis et des forests.  
(Rémy Belleau, *Bergerie*)

The transformation of the adjective *recoi* into the substantive *recoi* was probably the result of an ellipsis and took place early: (*locus*) *requ[i]ētus*. French has a number of words of this type where the substantival use of the adjective goes back to Latin: *aube* < (*dies*) *alba*; *chaussée* < (*via*) *calciata*; *fromage* < (*caseum*) *formaticum*; *hiver* (OF *ivern*) < (*tempus*) *hibernum*; etc., and the process has continued active through the history of the French language and is today a very common phenomenon of popular speech. In the early texts *recoi* is used almost invariably in a set expression *en un recoi*. Godefroy cites one example of a noun *recoite* s.f., 'lieu retiré' from *Berte aus grans piés* (13th c.) and from the same text *en recoite* 'secrètement,' in which we can see the Picard feminine adjective *recoite*, constructed by analogy on masculine *recoit*.<sup>8</sup> Here the ellipsis may have been understood to be some feminine noun such as *place*.

reproduisent probablement des combinaisons latines." Nyrop does not explain further *recoi*.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. the edition of Koschwitz, verses 382, 487, 728.

<sup>8</sup> Final Latin unsupported *t* was maintained and pronounced in parts of northeastern France long after it had become silent elsewhere. From the same text *Berte aus grans piés* 1341, cf. *laidite* (*laidir*); cf. Schwan-Behrens, *Grammaire de l'ancien français*, p. 150, § 274 R.



It appears, therefore, that article no. 7234 of the first edition of the REW (*requ[i]étus*) should be restored to its place. It is interesting to note that *\*requētus* (*requiescere*) had in the Vulgar Latin of northern France a continuous existence apart from *quētus* (*quiētus*) and that its descendents in Romance are found only there, although there is a trace of the derived verb form *\*requētare*, the etymon of OF *raqueer*, *recoier*, in modern Italian patois. *Recoi* the adjective lived on in French into the 16th century. *Recoi* the noun was admitted to the dictionary of the French Academy in 1698 but was dropped from the edition of 1718. We may still have it in the word *recoin* which first appears in the 16th century (Robert Estienne 1549) and which may represent a modification of *recoi* due to analogy with *coin*.<sup>9</sup>

CHARLES H. LIVINGSTON

Bowdoin College

## STENDHAL, JOINVILLE ET UN CONTE ARABE

Paul Arbelet a rempli tout un volume des plagiats que Stendhal s'est permis dans *L'Histoire de la peinture en Italie*.<sup>1</sup> Mais le sujet semble inépuisable.

Il y a, au tome premier de l'ouvrage, un court chapitre de quelques lignes seulement, "qui paraît ne se relier ni à ce qui précède ni à ce qui suit," dit Paul Arbelet dans son commentaire, "Beyle s'est plu à mystifier son lecteur."<sup>2</sup> Voici le chapitre tout entier:

<sup>9</sup> Such is the opinion of Gamillscheg, *op. cit.*: "*recoin* 'verborgener Schlupfwinkel' 16. Jhdt., ist Kreuzung von afrz. *recoi* dass. mit *coin* Winkel." Some of the early examples of *recoin* cited by Littré have the sense of *recoi* 'lieu retiré.' Littré believes *recoin* to be a compound of *re* + *coin* and such is also the opinion of Nyrop (*op. cit.*, III, 223 § 489), the *Dictionnaire général*, Bloch-Wartburg, and Dauzat. *Coin* signified in the Middle Ages 'point, wedge.' The sense 'corner' is first attested in the 16th century, at a time, therefore, when *recoi* was still in current usage. The sense *recoin* 'lieu retiré' may then be the early meaning instead of representing a derived sense as Littré believes. The idea that *recoin* is a combination (Gamillscheg 'Kreuzung') of *recoi* and *coin* seems entirely plausible.

<sup>1</sup> Paul Arbelet: *L'Histoire de la peinture en Italie et les plagiats de Stendhal*. Paris, Calmann Lévy.

<sup>2</sup> Stendhal: *Histoire de la peinture en Italie*. Texte établi et annoté avec Préface et Avant-propos par Paul Arbelet. Tome premier. Paris, Champion, 1924, I, 344-345.

## Chapitre XXXIII

Épreuve sous la statue d'Isis.

Une femme se promenait dans les rues d'Alexandrie d'Egypte, les pieds nus, la tête échevelée, une torche dans une main, une aiguère dans l'autre. Elle disait: "Je veux brûler le ciel avec cette torche, et éteindre l'enfer avec cette eau, afin que l'homme n'aime son Dieu que pour lui-même."<sup>3</sup>

Quant aux sources du passage, Arbelet n'en dit rien. Or, voici un passage de l'*Histoire de Saint Louis* de Joinville:

Tandis qu'ils allaient de leur hôtel à l'hôtel du soudan, frère Yves vit une vieille femme qui traversait la rue, et portait à la main droite une écuelle pleine de feu, et à la gauche une fiole pleine d'eau. Frère Yves lui demanda: "Que veux-tu faire de cela?" Elle lui répondit qu'elle voulait avec le feu brûler le paradis, afin qu'il n'y en eût plus jamais, et avec l'eau éteindre l'enfer, afin qu'il n'y en eût plus jamais. Et il lui demanda: "Pourquoi veux-tu faire cela? — Parce que je ne veux pas que nul fasse jamais le bien pour avoir la récompense du paradis, ni par peur de l'enfer; mais simplement pour avoir l'amour de Dieu, qui vaut tant, et qui nous peut faire tout le bien possible."<sup>4</sup>

Comme on voit, Stendhal abrège le passage considérablement, tout en déchaussant et décoiffant la vieille femme à la romantique (Joinville ne nous la présente ni "échevelée" ni "les pieds nus"). Mais pour le reste, il ne retient que l'essentiel, c'est-à-dire ce qui peut servir à diminuer le prestige de la religion. (Personne n'ignore l'anticléricalisme de Stendhal.)

Monsieur Robert Vigneron, à qui j'ai fait part de ma petite découverte, dit qu'il doit y avoir une source intermédiaire entre Joinville et Stendhal, et c'est un fait que Stendhal ne mentionne avoir lu Joinville ni dans son journal, ni dans sa correspondance. Quelle est cette source intermédiaire? Monsieur Vigneron dit qu'il faudrait chercher du côté des idéologues.

Quant à Joinville lui-même, il ne semble avoir fait, à ce que m'informe M. H. C. Lancaster, que rapporter un petit conte arabe dont M. Gustave von Grünebaum, professeur de langue arabe à l'Université de Chicago, a eu l'obligeance de m'indiquer la source (ou une source).

Dans ses *Studies in Early Mysticism in the Near and Middle*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 168.

<sup>4</sup> Jean sire de Joinville: *Histoire de Saint Louis—Credo—Lettre à Louis X.* Texte original, accompagné d'une traduction par M. Natalis de Wailly. Paris, Firmin Didot, 1874, pp. 243-5.

*East*,<sup>5</sup> Mme Margaret Smith rapporte par rapport à la mystique Rābi'a al-'Adawiyya qui vécut de 717 à 801 à peu près :

There is a story told of how a number of the Sūfis saw that Rābi'a had taken a torch in one hand and water in the other and was hastening on her way with them. They asked her the meaning of her action, and she said, "I am going to light a fire in Paradise and to pour water on the Hell, so that both veils (*i. e.* hindrances to the vision of God Himself) may vanish altogether from before the pilgrims and their purpose may be sure, and the servants of God may see Him, without any object of hope or any motive of fear. What if the Hell did not exist? Not one would worship the Lord or obey Him." \*

Et Mme Smith ajoute à sa note le passage de Joinville s'y référant comme à "a similar incident related in de Joinville's *Histoire de Saint Louis*," c'est-à-dire sans dire si elle considère le conte arabe comme la source de Joinville.

Il est à remarquer qu'en résumant le conte arabe, Mme Smith emploie "torche" comme Stendhal, tandis que Joinville parle d'une "écuelle pleine de feu," ce qui pourrait indiquer qu'entre le conte arabe et Stendhal il y ait eu un auteur autre que Joinville ou, peut-être, un manuscrit de Joinville autre que celui dont se servit Natalis de Wailly.

ELIZABETH CZONICZER

Chicago

#### DU BELLAY'S OLIVE CXII AND THE RIME DIVERSE

In 1900 Joseph Vianey published a study of Joachim du Bellay's *Olive*<sup>1</sup> which considerably modified current impressions of that poet's originality in subject and tone. From the poems of some twenty-six named authors and of some unknown, Joachim had "imitated" (critics had a harsher word for it) a considerable total of material, which he had found in the first and second volumes of the series now known generally as the *Rime diverse*, and which he elaborated in the first and the second edition of his sonnet-sequence.

<sup>5</sup> *Studies in Early Mysticism in the Near and Middle East*, by Margaret Smith, M. A., Ph. D. London, The Sheldon Press, 1931. Pp. 187-188.

\* Aflākī, "Manāquib al-'Arifin," fol. 114 a.

<sup>1</sup> Joseph Vianey, "Les Sources italiennes de 'l'Olive'," *Annales internationales d'Histoire. Congrès de Paris 1900* (Paris: Colin, 1901), p. 71.

In the following year Hugues Vaganay<sup>2</sup> noticed what Vianey had not mentioned: that there are two editions of each volume (differing appreciably in contents), and indeed a third of Volume I.<sup>3</sup> Vaganay had, it seemed, compared I<sup>1</sup> with I<sup>2</sup> and II<sup>1</sup> with II<sup>2</sup>, and found that the poems which Vianey had cited from the second edition of each volume appeared also in the first; his conclusion was that it could not be determined whether Du Bellay had before him the first or the second edition of either volume. However, Vaganay had clearly made no detailed comparison of the contents to supplement Vianey's, and the matter has rested there. Chamard incorporated Vianey's results into the notes to his critical edition of Du Bellay's poetical works, where they are generally accessible.<sup>4</sup>

There might be profit in a more complete study of the several editions and volumes of the *Rime* than has so far been made (for instance, the index of II<sup>2</sup> is very corrupt, and seems to be merely a

<sup>2</sup> Hugues Vaganay, "Joachim du Bellay et les 'Rime diverse di molti eccellentissimi autori'," *Revue d'Histoire littéraire de la France*, VIII (1901), 687.

<sup>3</sup> The following data come directly from the title-pages of the first four books published:

1. *Rime diverse di molti eccellentiss. autori nuovamente raccolte. Libro primo. In Vinetia appresso Gabriel Giolito di Ferrarii MDXLV.* This work may be designated I<sup>1</sup>. A copy is in the University of Chicago library.
2. *Rime diverse di molti eccellentiss. autori nuovamente raccolte. Libro primo, con nuova additione ristampato. In Vinetia appresso Gabriel Giolito di Ferrarii MDXLVI.* This may be designated I<sup>2</sup>; a copy is at Chicago. Vianey's references are to this edition, but he suppresses "Con nuova additione ristampato."
3. *Rime di diversi nobili huomini et eccellenti poeti nella lingua thoscana. Libro secondo. In Vinetia appresso Gabriel Giolito di Ferrarii MDXLVII.* This may be designated II<sup>1</sup>; a copy is at Chicago, but bound and labeled as "Vol. II, Giolito 1546."
4. *Delle rime di diversi nobili huomini et eccellenti poeti nella lingua thoscana. Nuovamente ristapate [sic]. Libro secondo. In Vinetia appresso Gabriel Giolito de Ferrari MDXLVIII.* This work may be designated II<sup>2</sup>. A copy is the property of Professor Fucilla of Northwestern University, who kindly made it available. It was this edition which Vianey used for his study of the *Rime*; but as in the case of I<sup>2</sup> his bibliographical reference surprisingly omits the words "nuovamente ristampate," which mark the edition as not a first.

<sup>4</sup> Joachim du Bellay. *Œuvres poétiques. I. Recueils de sonnets* (part 1). Paris: Cornély, 1908, p. 1. Chamard recognized the fact that Vianey had worked from second editions.

careless reproduction of the index to II<sup>1</sup>; so that the presence of a first line in the later index is no guarantee that the poem in question actually appears in the volume). Meanwhile it may be pointed out that Du Bellay's sonnet CXII of the *Olive* is an adaptation in his customary style of a sonnet by Veronica Gambara which appears both in the first and in the second edition of *Rime II*. Vianey overlooked the fact, and Chamard might have referred some of the terminology to the Italian poetess' final source in Saint Paul's Epistle to the Romans VIII, v. 28 sqq.:

And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them that are the called according to his purpose. For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren. Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified. . . . Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or the sword?

Veronica Gambara's sonnet develops the Pauline doctrine as follows (the text is from the first edition of 1547, with the variants of the second in parentheses):

Scelse da tutta la futura gente  
 Gli eletti suoi l'alta bontà infinita  
 Predestinando (Predestinati) a la futura vita  
 Per voler sol (Sol per voler) de la divina mente.  
 Questi tali poi chiama, e dolcemente  
 Seco gli unisce, e a ben far gl'invita,  
 Non per opra di lor saggia e (o) gradita,  
 Ma per voler di lui troppo clemente;  
 Chiamando li (gli) fa giusti, e giusti poi  
 Gli essalta si ch'al unico suo figlio  
 Gli (li) fa conformi, e poco men ch'eguali.  
 Qual potrà dunque mai danno, o periglio  
 Ne l'ultimo de gl'altri estremi mali  
 Da Christo separar gli eletti suoi?

Du Bellay in his turn follows Petrarchian tradition in giving sonnet form to religious matter: the 12th sonnet of the *Olive* recalls Veronica Gambara's with an accuracy which but slightly limits the smoothness of his craftsmanship:

Dedans le clos des occultes Idées,  
 Au grand troupeau des ames immortelles  
 Le Prevoyant a choisi les plus belles,

Pour estre à luy par luymesme guidées.  
 Lors peu à peu devers le ciel guidées  
 Dessus l'engin de leurs divines aeles  
 Vellent au seing des beautez eternelles,  
 Ou elle' sont de tout vice emondées.  
 Le Juste seul ses eleuz justifie,  
 Les reanime en leur premiere vie,  
 Et à son Filz les faict quasi egaulx.  
 Si donq' le ciel est leur propre heritage,  
 Qui les pourra frauder de leur partage  
 Au point qui est l'extreme de tous maulx?

The reminiscences of Plato's *Phaedrus* (249-50 particularly) in the first and the seventh lines of the sonnet somewhat mitigate the stark doctrine of Saint Paul and the Italian poetess; but there is little reason to suppose that Du Bellay was consciously recalling the Platonic-Christian current which is associated with the name of Saint Augustine and in which (under the brooding shadow of Jansen of Ypres and John Calvin) the French poet was for a moment naïvely dabbling.

ROBERT VALENTINE MERRILL

*The University of Chicago*

#### MAUPASSANT BORROWS FROM HIMSELF

Identical elements found in Guy de Maupassant's short stories and in his longer fiction have been noted from time to time by critics. Thus Sherard calls attention to the fact that *Un Lâche*, a tale in the volume *Contes du jour et de la nuit*, and the novel *Bel-Ami* both describe a *veillée d'armes* preceding a duel.<sup>1</sup> Boyd considers *le Vengeur*, volume *Boule de suif*, the first draught of the theme of Duroy's jealous hatred of his wife's former husband, also in *Bel-Ami*.<sup>2</sup> He likewise emphasizes the role of *Yveline Samoris*, in *le Père Milon*, as a preliminary rough sketch for the novelette *Yvette*.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Sherard, R. H., *The Life, Work, and Evil Fate of Guy de Maupassant*, New York, Brentano's, pp. 317, 318.

<sup>2</sup> Boyd, Ernest, *Guy de Maupassant, a Biographical Study*, New York and London, Knopf, 1926, p. 131.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 184, 185. To the above should be added: the well-known parallelism of *Clair de lune*, volume of the same title, with the episode of



What has apparently not been known is that Maupassant, in two of these cases, transposed the text of one work bodily into the other.<sup>4</sup>

For example, *Un Lâche* thus describes the mental distress of a man challenged to a duel:

Quand le vicomte fut rentré chez lui, il marcha pendant quelques minutes à grands pas vifs à travers sa chambre. Il était trop agité pour réfléchir à rien. Une seule idée planait sur son esprit: "un duel," sans que cette idée éveillât encore en lui une émotion quelconque. Il avait fait ce qu'il devait faire; il s'était montré ce qu'il devait être. On en parlerait, on l'approuverait, on le féliciterait. Il répétait à haute voix, parlant comme on parle dans les grands troubles de pensée:—Quelle brute que cet homme! <sup>5</sup>

*Bel-Ami* shows its principal character, Georges Duroy, one day in the early stages of his journalistic career, also deeply perturbed because he must fight a duel:

Dès qu'il fut seul, il marcha pendant quelques minutes à grands pas vifs, à travers sa chambre. Il était trop troublé pour réfléchir à rien. Une seule idée emplissait son esprit:—un duel demain,—sans que cette idée éveillât en lui autre chose qu'une émotion confuse et puissante. Il avait été soldat, il avait tiré sur des Arabes, sans grand danger pour lui, d'ailleurs, un peu comme on tire sur un sanglier à la chasse.

En somme, il avait fait ce qu'il devait faire. Il s'était montré ce qu'il devait être. On en parlerait, on l'approuverait, on le féliciterait. Puis il prononça à haute voix, comme on parle dans les grandes secousses de pensée: "Quelle brute que cet homme!" After examining his opponent's card he again exclaims, "Quelle brute!" <sup>6</sup>

The similarity of language continues throughout the reveries of the "anti-physical" priest of *Une Vie*, pp. 242-256, 311, 312 in the Albin Michel edition of the *Œuvres de Guy de Maupassant*, here used for all references to Maupassant's writings; the case of Paul and Henriette of the short story *Imprudence*, volume *Monsieur Parent*, and the visit of Duroy and his mistress, Madame Marelle, to various shady night-joints in Paris, *Bel-Ami*, pp. 118-122; the general theme of the stories *Fini*, volume *Toine*, and *M. Jocaste*, volume *Misti*, the love of a man for both a woman and her daughter, and that of *Fort comme la Mort*.

<sup>4</sup> We are here leaving out of consideration the case of *Par un soir de printemps*, *le Saut du berger*, and *la Veillée*, all in *le Père Milon*, prototypes of various incidents in *Une Vie*, which are mentioned by Boyd, as well as *M. Mongilet*, in *Toine*, and the chapter "Chez un ami" of *les Dimanches d'un bourgeois de Paris*. Footnotes, probably by the editor of the volumes of *inédits* published after Maupassant's death, point to the relationship and practical identity of the elements in question.

<sup>5</sup> *Contes du jour et de la nuit*, p. 53.

<sup>6</sup> Pp. 185, 186.

the two characters. As *Un Lâche* and *Bel-Ami* were both published in 1885, it would be difficult to say which of these two pieces represents the original.

In *Yveline Samoris* a man describes his visit to the home of the comtesse Samoris:

J'y allai. Pourquoi? direz-vous. Je n'en sais trop rien. J'y allai comme nous y allons tous, parce qu'on y joue, parce que les femmes sont faciles et les hommes malhonnêtes. Vous connaissez ce monde de flibustiers à décorations variées, tous nobles, tous titrés, tous inconnus aux ambassades, à l'exception des espions. Tous parlent de l'honneur à propos de bottes, citent leurs ancêtres, racontent leur vie, hâbleurs, menteurs, filous, dangereux comme leurs cartes, trompeurs comme leurs noms, l'aristocratie du bain enfin.

J'adore ces gens-là. Ils sont intéressants à pénétrer, intéressants à connaître, amusants à entendre, souvent spirituels, jamais banals comme des fonctionnaires publics. Leurs femmes sont toujours jolies, avec une petite saveur de coquinerie étrangère, avec le mystère de leur existence passée peut-être à moitié dans une maison de correction. Elles ont en général des yeux superbes et des cheveux invraisemblables. Je les adore aussi.

Mme Samoris est le type de ces aventurières, élégante, mûre et belle encore, charmeuse et féline, on la sent vicieuse jusque dans les moelles. On s'amusait beaucoup chez elle, on y jouait, on y dansait, on y soupait—enfin on y faisait tout ce qui constitue les plaisirs de la vie mondaine.<sup>7</sup>

In *Yvette* the comtesse Samoris has become the marquise Obardi, but otherwise the text remains practically unchanged. Note as a sample the following:

J'allai chez elle! Comment? Je ne le sais plus. J'y allai comme nous y allons tous là-dedans, parce qu'on y joue, parce que les femmes sont faciles et les hommes malhonnêtes. J'aime ce monde de flibustiers à décorations variées, tous étrangers, tous nobles, tous titrés, tous inconnus à leurs ambassades, à l'exception des espions.

The description continues paralleling that given in *Yveline Samoris*, except in respect to the women involved, where there are a few new elements:

Elles ont en général des yeux superbes et des cheveux incomparables, le vrai physique de l'emploi, une grâce qui grise, une séduction qui pousse aux folies, un charme malsain, irrésistible! Ce sont des conquérantes à la façon des routiers d'autrefois, des rapaces, de vraies femelles d'oiseaux de proie. Je les adore aussi.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>7</sup> *Le Père Milton*, pp. 210-212.

<sup>8</sup> Pp. 13, 14.

In *Yveline Samoris* the young heroine is said to be "une fille grande, magnifique, toujours joyeuse, toujours prête pour les fêtes, toujours riant à pleine bouche et dansant à corps perdu."<sup>9</sup> In *Yvette* the marquise Obardi has a daughter who is "grande, magnifique, mûre à point, dix-huit ans, aussi blonde que sa mère est brune, toujours joyeuse, toujours prête pour les fêtes, toujours riant à pleine bouche et dansant à corps perdu."<sup>10</sup>

However, despite the close linguistic similarity between the selections quoted,<sup>11</sup> it must be remembered that these function as parts of quite dissimilar wholes. That in *Un Lâche* records the reflections of a man who, overwhelmed by the possibility of future death, chooses the certainty of present self-destruction; the corresponding piece in *Bel-Ami* describes the agony of anticipation suffered by an individual destined, on the contrary, to be "quitte pour la peur" so far as injury in dueling is concerned. *Yveline Samoris* pictures a degenerate mother and a pure virgin daughter, soon to be separated by the tragedy of the latter's suicide; *Yvette* presents the mother as winning the daughter to her own evil ways after the girl's failure to end her life by taking chloroform.

It is thus plain that Maupassant, in transplanting material from one of his works to another, did not practice self-plagiarism. Instead, he was using an economy of means entirely consonant with originality.

G. M. FESS

University of Missouri

<sup>9</sup> *Le Père Milon*, p. 212.

<sup>10</sup> P. 14.

<sup>11</sup> *Le Vengeur*, whose substance closely resembles that of the corresponding episode in *Bel-Ami*, shows identical language only in Leuillet's remarks, *Boule de suif*, p. 257, "ce pauvre Souris, ah, oui, il en avait la tête (tête de cocu)" and "allons, avoue-le, avoue-le" of the same page, paralleling the "Sacristi, si quelqu'un en avait la tête, c'est bien lui, par exemple" of p. 277, and "Voyons—voyons—avoue-le" of p. 278, *Bel-Ami*. *Clair de lune*, *Imprudence*, *Fini*, and *M. Jocaste*, while revealing much likeness in content to their companion-elements in the longer fiction, differ from the latter completely in language.

A SUGGESTION AS TO THE ORIGIN OF *SUNDAE*

The origin of the word *sundae* has so baffled lexicographers that a tentative suggestion may not be out of place. The Oxford *English Dictionary* hesitantly puts forth the guess that it is possibly a re-spelling of *Sunday*; but the first form quoted by it, from the New York Evening Post of May 21, 1904, is *sundi*; and this has struck me rather forcibly, as it hits pretty closely an idea about the word that came to me several years ago.

Namely: the word *sandhi*, well known to linguists, from Sanskrit *saṁdhi*, "putting together," which was applied by the Sanskrit grammarians to the phonetic combination of two successive words, would in Anglo-Indian be pronounced 'sundi,' exactly as spelled in the Evening Post quotation;<sup>1</sup> and it would thus form a perfect pair with *punch*, the sweet mixed drink, which is simply the modern pronunciation of Sanskrit *pañca*, "five," minus the final vowel—and therefore, to the ear, Hindustani *panch*: the beverage being originally composed of five ingredients. A further parallel would also be found in *shrub*, sweetened fruit juice intended for making cooling drinks by the addition, originally and in England, of rum or other spirits, and of water in the United States: the word is from Arabic *sharāb*, "drink," but evidently came into English through Hindustani, from which we have the variant form *shrab*.

An examination of Anglo-Indian printed or manuscript matter from around the beginning of the present century might furnish corroborative evidence of the value of this hypothesis.

H. D. AUSTIN

University of Southern California

---

<sup>1</sup> It is of course common knowledge that the short-*a* of Sanskrit is in Hindustani (Urdu), and therefore in Anglo-Indian, pronounced *uh*: cf. 'pundit' for *pandit*, 'suttee' for *sati*, etc.

SOME LINGUISTIC STUDIES OF 1941-1944<sup>1</sup>

Two important American undertakings in the linguistic field have been completed since the publication of my last survey.<sup>2</sup> All six half-volumes of the *Linguistic Atlas of New England* are now out.<sup>3</sup> They include 734 maps, and make possible the comparative study of dialectal differences in the English of the area covered. It is greatly to be hoped that the other parts of the United States and Canada already studied by Professor Kurath and his helpers will be duly mapped in their turn, and that the survey of the rest of the country will be completed in good time. The speed of survey and of publication depends chiefly, of course, on the amount of money to be had for the purpose. So far the undertaking has had the needful financial backing, thanks to the interest shown by the A. C. L. S. and the authorities of Brown University. The four volumes of *A Dictionary of American English* are also now available.<sup>4</sup> The defects of this work, though serious, do not keep it from being our fullest and most convenient book of reference in the field to which it is devoted.

Another useful tool for the study of dialectal English in this country is Professor Harold Wentworth's *American Dialect Dictionary*.<sup>5</sup> The editor has gathered much unpublished material, besides drawing upon published sources (listed on pp. 737-747). In his preface, after many acknowledgments of indebtedness, he tells us that he is himself "the chief individual contributor of unpublished linguistic evidence to the Dictionary" (p. ix). The individual entries are made up chiefly of quotations; these may explain the pronunciation or the meaning of the word, or they may be passages in which the word occurs. The origin of many of the quotations is clearly marked, but in many other cases only date and locality are given. Thus, under *Harry* the quotation reads: "Old Hairy = the devil." It is preceded by "1938 s. w. Ind." We may

<sup>1</sup> Because of war conditions, few European books can be included in this survey.

<sup>2</sup> *MLN* LVII (1942) 123-148.

<sup>3</sup> Published by Brown University (Providence, R. I.), 1939-1943, with *Handbook*, 1939; sponsored by the American Council of Learned Societies, and edited by Hans Kurath and staff.

<sup>4</sup> Edited by W. A. Craigie and J. R. Hulbert, Chicago, 1938-1944.

<sup>5</sup> Crowell: New York, 1944. Pp. xvi, 747. \$6.

presume that in the year 1938 some student of the English of southwest Indiana heard or read the expression quoted. It is not made clear whether this student was the editor or somebody else. Moreover, one does not know whether the investigator (whoever he was) merely heard or read the expression *Old Hairy* and inferred its meaning, or whether the meaning too was supplied by the investigator's informant. The entry-word itself sometimes appears in its standard form (as here), the dialectal variant being given in the body of the entry. Sometimes, however, the opposite procedure is followed. Thus, the dialectal variant *cramberry* serves as entry-word, and the standard form is given by way of definition. The quotations are distinguished from editorial explanations and comments by being printed in smaller type, and by the fact that each quotation is dated and localized. The frequent quotations from the 1934 edition of the big Merriam Webster are dated but not localized. The same applies to a few other quotations. Little use seems to have been made of other dictionaries, though *DAE* and *OED* appear in the list of abbreviations. The size of the work may be gathered from the statement in the preface that it "contains more than 15,000 terms, . . . and 60,000 quotations."

The editor rightly devotes much of his space to dialectal pronunciations. These appear in dated and usually localized quotations. From the consistency of the phonetic transcriptions one would infer that the various systems used by the investigators quoted have as a rule been translated into the editor's own system, which is essentially that of Kenyon,<sup>6</sup> but in the absence of any statement of the editor's method of procedure we cannot be sure of what he did in this matter. Naive respellings in the quotations often (perhaps always) appear without change. Sometimes we get both naive respelling and scientific transcription in the same quotation: thus, "keow [kjæʊ]" in the quotation of 1907 under *cow*. Here it is not clear whether "[kjæʊ]" was added by the editor to explain *keow* or stood in the editor's source.

The key to pronunciation (p. xi) is misleading in at least one respect. All the examples of [ə] there given occur in unstressed syllables, and after the last example comes the notation "in unaccented syllables only," but in fact, of course, [ə] is freely used in

<sup>6</sup> For weaknesses of the system, particularly when it comes to unstressed syllables, see my discussion in *MLQ* III (1942) 5-8.



strest syllables too. Thus, *poor* is transcribed [poə], and we have no right to think that the editor made the mistake of reckoning this Mississippi pronunciation disyllabic. The key also prescribes the use of pointed [n] both for syllabic [n], as in *written*, and for syllabic [ŋ], as in *bacon*; but perhaps the editor simply ignores the existence of the latter articulation. Even the point is left off (presumably by misprint) in the transcription [ekn] under *acorn*. The [e] of the transcriptions [deemp, dæ:ens, sæev] for *damp, dance, salve* is wrong unless meant to mark the palatal timbre of [m, n, v] respectively in the dialectal pronunciations cited. Here as elsewhere it is not clear whether the transcription with [e] is the editor's or whether it goes back to his source of information. In the latter case some editorial comment on the faultiness of the transcriptions would have been in order. The same holds of the inexact use of [æ] for New England [a] in the transcriptions of *Dartmouth, Harvard, and park*. The transcription [pæk] in particular looks like a mechanical reproduction of the naive identification exemplified in the quotation from *New Yorker*: "[They] pronounced 'park' as though it were 'pack.'"

Some of the entries are not words but categories. Thus, we find a useful entry called "Eye Dialect." To this entry the reader is referred under each individual word-entry which exemplifies the category. At any rate, such was the author's intent, but in practice the reference is not always given. It should be added to the entry *britches*, and to such spellings as *and* for *in*, *a-tall* for *at all*, and *of* for *have*. The spelling *spitten image* for *spit and image* is also a case in point. The editor might to advantage have had more entries of this kind. Thus, an entry devoted to unvoicing would take care of such cases as *ahint, holt, islant*, for *behind, hold, island*. On the other hand, such an entry may be made too inclusive. Thus, the entry "Excrescent Sounds" takes up, under "N," several types which do not properly go together: (1) liaison *n*, as in *nagent* < *an agent*; (2) suffixal *n*, as in *hisn* etc., where the *n* has the grammatical function of distinguishing pronoun from adjective; (3) the blend *clearn*, made by blending *clear* and *clean*; (4) malformations like *shampooon*, where the rare final *oo* has been replaced by the more familiar *oon* (as in *harpoon, spittoon*); and (5) infixal *n*, as in *Uninted States*.<sup>7</sup> This would not be so bad if the types

<sup>7</sup> Under *nineted*, an aphetic form of *benighted* with *n*-infix, I miss a cross-reference to "Excrec. N." Indeed, this word is left wholly unexplained.

specified were distinguished in the entry, but they are not; the distinctions just made are mine, not Mr Wentworth's. The editor contents himself with saying that excrescent sounds "are usually occasioned by preceding or following sounds, but sometimes by analogical processes." Other subheads under "excrescent sounds" are open to like criticism. Thus, the formation *shantsy* exemplifies the familiar suffix *sy*, which here has replaced *y*; similarly *teensy* for *teeny*. In such cases we are dealing with morphemic units, suffixes, not with an excrescent sound. On the other hand, *colyum* for *column* seems to be a mere matter of pronunciation (to make the word rime with *volume*) and one would therefore expect to find *colyum* listed under "Excresc. Y," though it is not so listed.

The editor or his source sometimes offers an etymology for a dialect word, sometimes lets it go without explanation. Examples of dubious or wrong historical observations:

comparable: "Accent on *com*, orig. on *par*." [But note ME *cómparable*]

cramberry: "Folk ety." [Actually exemplifies assimilation]

glob: "perh. from *gob*." [Actually blend of *gob* and *lob* 'lump.']

Henery: "Perh. by confusion with *hennery*." [Old svarabhakti vowel].

shades 'smithereens': "Perh. from *shard*." [*Gone to shades* might also be explained as meaning 'gone to the shades, i. e. to Hades.']

spit and image: "must have orig. been *spirit and image*" [Compare French *portrait tout craché*, and see *NED* under the noun *spit*].

Sometimes the editor inserts a bracketed exclamation point after a "howler" in a quotation; he might have done this oftener. Unexplained words include *Gee* (short for *Jesus*), *Jerusalem crickets* (euphemism for *Jesus Christ*), *Geeminy* (from Latin *Gemini*, i. e. Castor and Pollux), and other ejaculations. The OE words *bearm* 'emotion,' *goldtorht* 'bright as gold,' and *treddan* 'investigate' are given in their original form and meaning, but are presented as Tennessee dialect words on the strength of a novel of 1928, without mention of Old English. In general, the editor is not critical enough of his quotations. These vary greatly in accuracy, completeness of presentation, and authority, but he seldom brings this variation out. Professional students of the English language can often make the proper allowances, it is true, particularly when the source of a quotation is given. Thus, a newspaper item to the effect that *horrible* becomes *harble* in Baltimore will not deceive some of us because out of our own knowledge we can add the important detail that [r] here is syllabic. Again, when the *New Yorker* states that in

California *subway* means 'underpass,' some of us add a mental note to the effect that this is standard British use, and exemplifies the influence of British English on California speech. At a higher level of authority "*chare* standard use; *chore* U. S." does not disturb us overmuch, since, in spite of this quotation from Webster's dictionary, we know that *chare* is standard British, *chore* standard American use. But most users of the work under review will not be able to make these corrections and additions, and it is unfortunate that Mr Wentworth has not chosen to criticize and supplement his quotations more systematically.

Certain of the entries might with profit be revised in various ways. "Redundant" *already* in Lancaster Co., Pennsylvania, should be considered anew in the light of the German strain in the population. *Collash* is better called a blend; the expression "combination word" is clumsy and needlessly amateurish in tone. The standard Southern pronunciation of some words (e. g. *coarse* and *course*) is not clearly brought out. The pronunciation of *Newfoundland* is treated too stingily. More quotations ought to be given. In spite of Webster, "he looks badly" is not dialectal, though most people probably apprehend the *badly* as an adverb. The entries *eat* and *et* are badly arranged. There should be two entries, but not as now. The first entry should be *eat*, *et* pret.; the second, *eat*, *et* ptc. In the first entry, attention should be called to the fact that [et], spelled *eat*, is still standard British usage. The spelling *et* for the preterit is an example of eye dialect. In the past participle, standard usage everywhere prescribes *eaten*, and both *eat* and *et* are strictly dialectal forms. The third heading under *Episcopal* should be made a separate entry: *Episcopalian* or *Episco(po)lopian*. The pronunciation given for *goober* is unfamiliar to me. In my dialect it is always [gubə]. The postulated variant form *sheer* which *here* takes after *t* (p. 289) is to be rejected. The sandhi-affricate formed in the sequence *right here* is a single though composite phoneme, and differs, both phonetically and phonemically, from a sequence made up of [t] and [ʃ]. The pronunciation of *syringe* with ultima stress occurs in the south (Va.) as well as in New York.

One would expect omissions in a dictionary of this kind (indeed, in any dictionary). The phrase *in back of* 'behind' might have been included; certainly it would be interesting to know something

of its geographical range (it is not native to me). How widespread is *counsel* in the sense 'consul'? Where are the teeth said to be washed, where brushed? The author gives us an entry for *give goodbye* but none for *tell goodbye*. The good old Maryland words *bugeye* 'kind of boat' and *espantoon* 'policeman's stick (billy)' are wanting. On the other hand, it is hard to see why words like *citified* and *moonrise* are in this dictionary. Such words can hardly be called dialectal from any point of view. Many other words, included for the sake of their pronunciation, might be left out with little damage to the book. Thus, *moral* and *horrid*, in spite of the difference in spelling, illustrate the same point of dialectal variation and one or the other might be dispensed with. Yet though such words are not strictly needed in such numbers, they are worth having nevertheless, if only for the reader's convenience. Of misprints, apart from the one already noted, I have found only two: *pealing* (p. 549) and *stkif* (p. 652). The [m]-form of *contrary* quoted is queer enough for a misprint but may not be one. The mute *e* kept *contrary* to rule in *bideable* and *toteable* stands out against the regular forms *abidable* and *totable* given in the corresponding quotations and therefore presumably is no misprint, but a deliberate editorial spelling; compare the editor's "unlikeable" in his definition of *skite*. Devotees of such spellings are respectfully referred to the article "Mute E" in H. W. Fowler's *Modern English Usage*.

Mr Wentworth uses the term *dialect* for standard as well as sub-standard regional variations, a use familiar in historical linguistic study but not familiar to the general public. In Mr Wentworth's sense the Kenyon-Knott work on American pronunciation also comes under the head of dialectology.<sup>8</sup> Since however only standard pronunciations are included, and since the distinctions made (between northern, eastern, and southern forms) are put in the broadest possible terms, the emphasis in this work is clearly not dialectal. The editors try to record the local pronunciation of proper names, where this does not agree with regional or national practice, but I note that the pronunciation of *Georgia* prevalent in that state is not given: [dʒɔɪdʒə]. Unrecorded, too, is [fɜ(r)bət], the usual pronunciation of *sherbet*, and [depo] for *depot* is given

<sup>8</sup> J. S. Kenyon and T. A. Knott, *A Pronouncing Dictionary of American English*. Merriam: Springfield, Mass., 1944. Pp. lii, 484.

simply as a British form, though it is American enough as a military term. Danish *krone* is distinguished from German *krone*, oddly enough, by a final [ɛ], though both these words actually have [ə]. Such mistakes, however, are few. In general, this dictionary is a trustworthy guide, and stands without a rival as an authoritative record of standard American usage in the field which it covers: pronunciation. The fifth edition of Daniel Jones's *Dictionary*<sup>9</sup> is equally authoritative, of course, as a record of "received pronunciation" in Great Britain. This edition is "in the main a reprint of the fourth" (p. vi), but 102 words have been added and 243 other entries have been changed; the 345 entries affected are duly specified (though not reproduced) in Appendix II. The misprint [-d] for [-id] under *spit* still stands. The note under *Galsworthy* which, in the fourth edition, read "he himself is said to have pronounced gæl-" now reads, with greater positiveness and precision, "his family pronounces gæl-." One's pronunciation of one's own name is usually reckoned authoritative, but both Jones and Kenyon-Knott put [gæl-] in second place. The latter dictionary takes a stronger line in putting first the traditional pronunciation [kælɪs] for the French town *Calais*, a form which Jones relegates to a bracketed position as "less frequent." I agree with Kenyon-Knott against Jones that the traditional pronunciation should keep first place so long as it has any currency, even though it becomes less frequent. But the editors of the American work do not follow this principle with any consistency, so far as I can make out. They certainly follow it for *Calais* but not for *Sinai* and a number of other words. Both dictionaries go to needless trouble in recording variant spellings. Thus, Jones gives a bracketed [-ise] alongside every word ending in the suffix *-ize*. On the other hand, he does not record certain monstrosities of spelling (e. g. *likeable*, *moveable*) piously set down by Kenyon-Knott. The greatest weakness of both dictionaries lies in the treatment of unstressed syllables,<sup>10</sup> but their system of marking stress also gets them into trouble at times. Jones usually ignores secondary stress, and one cannot tell from such a transcription as [hɒspɪtl] whether the middle syllable has secondary stress or not. In Kenyon-Knott I find no instance of this difficulty,

<sup>9</sup> *An English Pronouncing Dictionary*. Dutton: New York, 1943. Pp. xxx, 496. \$2.50.

<sup>10</sup> See note 6 above.

but cases like *adrenalin* [æd'ren|ɪn] occur in which the stress-mark is misplaced (it ought to go before [d], of course). Here the trouble comes from uncertainty about the syllabic boundary. Mr Wentworth wisely avoids this difficulty by putting the stress-mark over the sonant of the stressed syllable.

Three other pronouncing dictionaries of English need consideration here.<sup>11</sup> Professor Greet's *World Words* is a "revised and enlarged edition" of his *War Words*. In both books he seeks to give broadcasters a rough practical idea of how to pronounce words which for one reason or another make trouble in up-to-the-minute speech. Most of these words are foreign proper names now very much in the news, but a number of English words, proper and common, are also included. The pronunciation is indicated by two systems of transcription, both of them rough and ready; one such system would surely have been enough. Variant pronunciations are given, if they exist, and not infrequently we get a discussion of these variants, and the author's reason for marking one of them preferable. Thus, the entries *penicillin* and *ration* take up about two-thirds of a page each. The discussions are written in a lively, popular style (sometimes a bit too snappy for conservative taste). Many besides broadcasters will find *World Words* a good buy; it meets a real need. The *Handbook* of Professor Bender will be found less useful. This book includes no discussion of variant pronunciations; it is a mere list of some 12,000 words, each provided with a single pronunciation, given in two transcriptions. The words chosen for inclusion, according to the author, are "words about which there is contention," and variant pronunciations are not given because "the plan of this book called for one pronunciation for each word." The author also includes "some proper names much in the news." Actually, many of the 12,000 words included make little trouble for anybody. Thus, few have any doubts as to how to pronounce *acid* or *Finn* or *jaw* (to take three at random). It is hard to understand why such words were included in such numbers, unless perhaps as an easy way of filling up space. Moreover, comparison with Kenyon-Knott (where standard variant pro-

<sup>11</sup> W. C. Greet, *War Words*, New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1943, pp. 137, \$1.50; W. C. Greet, *World Words*, New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1944, pp. viii, 402, \$3; J. F. Bender, *NBC Handbook of Pronunciation*, New York: Crowell, 1943, pp. xiv, 289, \$2.75.



nunciations are systematically given) reveals that Mr Bender often chooses a pronunciation either not recognized at all or not given first place by these authorities. A good college or even high-school dictionary will be found far more informative, even about pronunciation, than is Mr Bender's word-list, not to mention the other information that such a dictionary gives. It would be interesting to know how this book came to be published at all in these days of paper shortage. James Rowland Angell, in his foreword, tells us that "the National Broadcasting Company, in putting out this volume, does so with the hope that it may be found of genuine value, not only to broadcasters but to many persons interested in accurate and cultivated speech." This hope unluckily has little basis in the quality of the product.

Three other lexical works have come to hand in the years covered by this survey.<sup>12</sup> In Col. Colby's book of army terms most of the entries read like essays in miniature. The author is a veteran popularizer and knows how to give accurate information in attractive form. I will comment on a few details. There should be an entry *division*, even though limited to cross-references to the entries *square division* and *triangular division*. The word *barrage* properly means, not curtain but a system (or series) of bars or obstacles. The English spelling of *battalion* stands closer to Ital. *battaglione* than to F. *bataillon*. How is *blouse* pronounced in the army? *Caisson* has the same meanings in French and English. The spelling of *canteen* is interesting in that it tries to represent in English the pronunciation of French *cantine*. Contrast *machine*. The various pronunciations of *cantonment* might have been mentioned. *Captain* is from F. *capitaine*, not from L. *caput*, and *chaplain* is not directly from L. *capellanus*. The Latin *capreoli* 'props' gave rise to Spanish *cabriol*, but hardly to *chevron*, which represents a derivative of L. *caper* made with the French suffix *-on*. The r-form of *colonel* originated (by dissimilation) in French, not in English; it is not properly described as a corruption. The form *corporal* seems to have been a French modification of *caporal*; if so, it is to be connected with L. *caput*, not *corpus*. The word *deploy* is not from

<sup>12</sup> E. Colby, *Army Talk*, Princeton Univ. Press, 1942, pp. xiv, 232, \$2; C. K. Ogden, *The General Basic English Dictionary*, New York: Norton, 1942, pp. x, 441, \$2.50; *Ordbog over det danske Sprog*, Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1941, vol. xx, pp. 744.

Old French (the OF form was *despleier*, giving our *display*) but from later French; it does not occur in English before Caxton, whose speech is early Modern, not Middle English, and as a military term it does not antedate the eighteenth century. For *dragoon* see *PMLA* LVII (1942) 421-434 and LVIII (1943) 580 f. The etymology given for *gun* is a bit confused; ME. *gunne* is derivable, not from classical Icelandic *Gunnhildr* but from *Gunna*, a pet form of that name. A Latinized *domina gunilda* occurs as the name of a fourteenth century ballista. *Khaki* came into English from Urdu (i. e. Hindustani), though Urdu got it from Persian. For *Hindu* (p. 164) read *Hindi*. The author's comment on *ration* is worth quoting: "to pronounce it to rhyme with 'nation' is the mark of a civilian and a raw recruit. Old soldiers always pronounce it to rhyme with the first two syllables of 'national.'" *Taptoe*, the old form of *tattoo*, is a Dutch word. I have noted misprints on pp. 81 and 171.

✓ Mr Ogden's book is a dictionary of ordinary English; the words are defined in Basic, and the introductory matter is written in Basic. More than 20,000 entries are provided, and users of this dictionary will be able to put into the Basic form of English all the words entered. The pronunciation is indicated much as in D. Jones's *Pronouncing Dictionary*. The skill and accuracy with which the words are defined is noteworthy; obviously the Basic vocabulary suffices for work of this kind. I have noted a couple of serious misprints on p. x.

Vol. XX of the great Danish dictionary came out on time; it is to be hoped that the work on this dictionary has not been too seriously interfered with by war conditions, and that with the restoration of peace the remaining volumes can be issued as planned. The present volume begins with the word *Skær* and ends with *Sorrig*.

✓ Six more Tracts have been added to the long series of the *Society for Pure English*,<sup>13</sup> no less than three of them by Sir William Craigie. His subject in Tract LVIII is "Completing the Record of English"; in LIX, "Some Anomalies of Spelling"; in LXIII, "Problems of Spelling Reform." The first of these is of considerable interest and importance; the other two have less value

<sup>13</sup> S. P. E. Tracts LVIII-LXIII, Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1941-1944. Pp. 265-304, 305-332, 333-364 (completing Vol. VI); pp. 1-28, 29-44, 45-76 (beginning Vol. VII).

for the student, though interesting enough to read. Tract LX is an index of Vols. V and VI, compiled by E. M. Ruhm. Tract LXI consists of two studies by C. T. Onions, one on "The Fate of French -é in English," the other on "The Plural of Nouns ending in -th." Both studies are of the first quality, as one would expect. Tract LXII, by G. M. Young, is a critique of Basic English. The verdict is highly unfavorable. No doubt some proponent of Basic will have a chance to reply in a future Tract.

Two volumes on English place-names are included in this survey.<sup>14</sup> The volume on Middlesex is Vol. XVIII of the English Place-Name Society. The names are given, as usual, by hundreds, and the first five hundreds (Spelthorne, Isleworth, Elthorne, Gore, and Edmonton) are presented much as hundreds appear in earlier volumes of the Society. The fully urban Ossulstone Hundred, however, is taken up by boroughs, to which are added the half-borough of Chiswick (put between Chelsea and Ealing) and the City of Westminster. The Temple is also included, since, though within the City of London, it is extra-parochial. Field-names the history of which is more or less traceable are given together (pp. 207-217), arranged by hundreds and parishes. The following comments deal with various details. *Shepperton* might be from OE *sceapheord* 'flock of sheep' plus *tun*; if so, the name meant 'farm where there was a flock of sheep.' Under *Ridsworth* the form *Rudda* is wrongly called strong. The *l* of *Charlton* can hardly have arisen by "interchange of *d* and *l*." The *d* became *l*, it would seem, by dissimilation: *rd . . . t* > *rl . . . t*. So also in *Harlington*. The pronunciation [hesən] given for *Heston* perhaps ought to be [hesn], but the authors in general seem not to distinguish syllabic consonants from consonants preceded by [ə]. The "long *i*" of *Isleworth* is historically correct and cannot properly be called curious. The *au* spellings of *Cranford* show that this diphthong developed before nasals in native as well as French words; see *MP* XX 189 ff. The first element of *Hillingdon* need not be hypocoristic; it may be merely a weak form of the familiar woman's name *Hild*. The first el. of *Yiewsley* may be the familiar man's name *Wifel*, with loss of *l*

<sup>14</sup> J. E. B. Gover, Allen Mawer, and F. M. Stenton, *The Place-Names of Middlesex apart from the City of London*; Cambridge, at the University Press; New York, the Macmillan Co.; 1942; pp. xxxiv, 237; \$5. Helge Kökeritz, *The Place-Names of the Isle of Wight* (*Nomina Germanica* 6), Uppsala, 1940, pp. cxii, 307 (with two maps).

by dissimilation. Compare *Wesley* from earlier *Wellesley*. "The later phonological development" from *Wewesley* to *Yewsley* is not "difficult of explanation." The initial *w* was lost by dissimilation; the resultant *Ewesley* fully accounts for the later *Yewsley* or *Yiewsley*, where the initial *y* is a mere spelling. Compare *ewe* and *yew*. The *Roe*-, earlier *Rowe*-, of *Roegreen* is derivable from ME *wrowe*, OE *wrogen* 'hidden, protected.' Derivation from ON *vrá* would indeed "be surprising in Middlesex." In *Wrolandes* the second *w* seems to have been lost by dissimilation. *Danfords* is a good example of dissimilatory loss of *r*. Similarly, *Bethnal* exemplifies dissimilatory loss of *l*. In *Gunnersbury* however assimilation of *l* to the *r* of the second el. took place. *Walham* from earlier *Wanham* illustrates a dissimilation by which nasal plus nasal became liquid plus nasal. Under *Padderswick* (now Ravenscourt Park) the authors say: "The forms with *n* show common confusion of *l* and *n*, those with *d* are due to confusion between the point-consonants *l* and *d*." Such unsatisfactory explanations of phonetic peculiarities are, I regret to say, too frequent in the volumes of the Society. The change from *l* to *n* is a case of assimilation: *Palyngewyk* became *Paningewyk* by anticipation of the nasal articulation which was to follow. The much later change from *Paningwick* to *Padingwick* is a case of dissimilation: the first nasal lost its nasality and became a simple stop. The derivation of *Wormwood* from *Wormholt* leaves much to be desired. The spellings indicate that the latter tended to lose its *t*, not its *l*, though the *l* might become *r* by assimilation. *Wormwood* is better explained as a syncopated form of *Wormolle wood*, with vocalization of the *l* and eventual loss of the weak syllable. The *l* of *Kilburn* is simply an example of dissimilation; to explain it, one need not "take the first element to be the personal name *Cylla*." The loss of *r* in *Mary(le)bone*, earlier *Maryborne*, is a case of dissimilation. *Battlebridge* is derivable from the earlier *Batford Bridge* by folk etymology, but *Batford* comes from the old name *Bradford* by phonetic processes: the *f* unvoiced the *d* to *t*, and the first *r* was lost by dissimilation. The authors do not make this distinction clear when they say that "the later name seems to be a mere corruption of the old one through folk etymology." The derivation given for *Tottenham Court* is unsatisfactory; the authors themselves admit that the early forms "with initial *þ* and *th* are a little disturbing."

It is obvious that the forms in *t-* can be derived from those in *þ* (which would become *t-* in the construction with *æt*), whereas it is impossible to derive the forms in *þ-* from those in *t-*. Sound method, therefore, forces us to presume a first element *þotta*, even though "no name *þotta* is known." This would not be the only *hapax* in the field of place-names. I take it that *þotta* was a nickname, meaning 'the howler,' from the nil-grade *þot* of the base *þeot* 'howl, roar.' The *tt* exemplifies hypocoristic gemination. The first element of *Neasden* seems to be OE *neosu* 'nose.' One need not postulate "confusion between OE *næss* and *nōs(e)*."

✓ Professor Kökeritz's book on Isle of Wight place-names is a superior piece of work. I have only a few comments on matters of detail. The forms in *Bule-*, *Bole-* of *Budbridge* should have been brought together in one group; with them probably goes the form *Bouebrugge*, where the first *u* may represent a vocalized *l*. The el. *Bule-*, *Bole-* is perhaps to be connected with *bole* 'trunk of a tree.' If so, it is synonymous with the *butt* 'trunk of a tree' which the author takes to be the first element of the alternative form *Butbridge*, *Budbridge*, and the variation between *bole* and *butt* strengthens the author's interpretation of *butt*, and supports his rejection of Ekwall's etymology. The author's statement that OE *buttuc* (modern *buttock*) is "a diminutive of an OE \**butt* with much the same meaning" is self-contradictory and should be corrected to the purely descriptive "k-derivative." So also *puttock* (p. 36). Compare *pussock* (p. 156), certainly no diminutive of *puss*, though just as certainly derived from *puss* by adding the k-suffix. The author presumes (p. 14) that in forms like *Honingeford* the *n* "must be an error for *u*." In consequence, he assigns these forms to the entry *Huffingford* rather than to *Horringford*. But *Honingeford* may perfectly well go back to an earlier *Horningeford* by dissimilatory loss of *r*. In his discussion of *Luccombe* the author fails to consider the OE noun *lufu* 'love,' which, according to J. Hoops (*Beowulfstudien* 111), may also have had the pregnant sense 'Wohnung.' The transcription of *Rowborough* includes a phonetic symbol not explained on p. cxi. The variant name *Schaldewelle* for *Colwell* is hardly a "case of the exchange of synonymous prefixes," as the el. *Schalde-* presumably represents OE *sceald* 'shallow.' The form *Sharpenode* under *Sconce Point* is a good example of the loss of *r* by dissimilation. Part of the entry *Dow's Place* seems to be missing. I have noted misprints on pp. 13, 19, 193.

Professor Kökeritz has also published an important book on the pronunciation of English taught by Mather Flint, a Jacobite who took refuge in Paris *circa* 1720.<sup>15</sup> The heart of the volume is the reprint of Flint's *Prononciation de la Langue Angloise*. The text reproduced is that of 1740, but additions made in the ed. of 1754 are incorporated as bracketed insertions, and other readings of the second ed. are given in footnotes. A long introduction discusses, among other things, the career of Flint and his competence as an orthoepist. Pp. 79 ff. give us an analytical study of Flint's pronunciation, a short monograph (pp. 136-152) on "The Reduction of Initial KN and GN," a word index and a bibliography. In this book Kökeritz demonstrates his mastery of the material. He has made available to scholars a long neglected but important witness, from whom we can learn much. Through this witness he has dealt another body-blow to Luick's heterodox theories about the vocalism of early Modern English.<sup>16</sup> He grows heterodox himself, however, when he comes to treat the development of short *a* before *-r* and *-r-* plus consonant. There can be no doubt that Flint likened the *a* here to French *a*; that is, to [a], a sound somewhat advanced but not palatal. In other words, Flint's *a* in this position marks the stage of development which immediately preceded the current [a]. But there are clear indications that Flint's [a] came from an earlier long or half-long [æ]. In his discussion of the "diphthongs" *ua*, *ue*, *ui*, Flint observes:

quand un *g* précède la diphtongue, *gu* se prononce comme dans le mot *guérir*. On sent seulement après le son du *g*, comme un *i* qui le rend moins sec, plus plat. [Exemples:] *guard*, *guardian*, *guess*, *guest*, *guilt*.

This palatalization of [g] of course was brought about by the palatal vowel that followed. That is to say, Flint's pronunciation of *guard* and *guardian* shows that the *a* of these words was once [æ] in quality, although by Flint's time this [æ] seems to have been retracted to [a], leaving the palatal [g] as a relic of the former pronunciation. We conclude that the orthodox view is correct in deriving [a > a] before *r* from an earlier long or half-long [æ], a view which Kökeritz wrongly rejects (p. 87). I add a few other comments. The distinction in length which Flint makes between

<sup>15</sup> H. Kökeritz, *Mather Flint on Early Eighteenth-Century English Pronunciation*, Uppsala, 1944, pp. xlviii, 189.

<sup>16</sup> See *MLN* XLIII 507-508 and XLVI 11-13.



the *a* of *detach*, *attach* and that of *catch*, *match*, *patch*, etc. (p. 83) seems to be based on the spelling; such a distinction makes one suspicious of the accuracy of his ear. Flint's "short *o*" in *revolt* (p. 118) is still current in America. With the variant pronunciation *perce* which Flint records for *pierce* (p. 29; cf. p. 123) compare Falstaff's quibble in *1 Henry IV*, v. 3. 58. The name *Pierce* is still pronounced *Perce* in New England. The "unstressed [*i*] . . . in *flagon* 22" (p. 129) is only a misprint, duly corrected to *e* in the ed. of 1754. The "early NE" pronunciation of *servile* (p. 130) is recorded as current in Kenyon-Knott. It is unfortunate that Kökeritz did not include in his index all the words given in Flint's *Prosodie* (pp. 54-75). Thus, if one looks up *stomach* in the index, one is referred to p. 37, where one finds nothing of interest. This word also occurs, however, on p. 55, where the vowel of its termination *ach* is marked for pronunciation as short *i*, if I interpret Flint's rubric correctly. I have noted misprints on pp. xxxvi (dittography), 9, and 132.

✓ Another study of early Modern English pronunciation is that of Professor William Matthews.<sup>17</sup> This study gives us a welcome supplement to the earlier work of the author and of Kökeritz on early shorthand manuals and documents. The author wisely arranges his material in such a way as "to facilitate comparison with" that given by Kökeritz (p. 145). His work has been well done. In particular, he shows commendable caution in coming to positive conclusions about the phonological meaning to be deduced from a shorthand spelling. I have noted a few details which require comment. The spellings *tord* and *tords* almost certainly "turn on the first vowel" of *toward(s)*, and this material should be transferred from p. 149 to p. 200. The pronunciation of *toward(s)* as a disyllable with ultima stress is a late spelling-pronunciation; in my childhood it was reckoned a vulgarism, and this is still my reaction to it. I cannot agree that "the evidence clearly points to the use of both diphthongic and monophthongic pronunciations" of *ai* (p. 152). The evidence for the monophthong is clear, of course, but that for the diphthong is exceedingly dubious. Thus, when Nicholas says that the *i* of *faith* is "scarcely sounded" (p. 151), his statement points toward monophthong, not diphthong.

<sup>17</sup> *English Pronunciation and Shorthand in the Early Modern Period* (Univ. of Calif. Pub. in English, ix, 3, 135-214), 75c.

Was Tiffin's *eat* (p. 157) the present or the preterit form? I can find in the examples given no evidence that ME [o] was pronounced [ɔ] before *r* (p. 162). The spelling *dore* clearly means [dɔr], not [dɒr], and in the light of spellings like *kot*, *klok* for *coat*, *cloak* (p. 163) and *or*, *dot* for *hour*, *doubt* (p. 171), such forms as *dor* for *door* are without evidential value. The orthodox view is that early Modern [ur] of whatever origin underwent lowering to [ɔr], and that the further lowering to [ɔr] is a late peculiarity of Southern British speech (it is not recognized in the *NED*). Matthews has brought forward nothing to overthrow this view. I cannot make out how such spellings as *vos* for *voice* reflect a diphthong (p. 164). The spelling *donmore* for *Dunmow* may indicate the development of a hiatus-filling *r* in sandhi but it does not support a diphthongal [ɔu] but rather a monophthongal [o] as the phonetic value of *ow* (p. 167). The spelling *Morbray* for *Mowbray* is probably a mere mistake for *Mobray* and also gives evidence for the monophthongal [o]; the extra *r* is an example of a familiar kind of error; by anticipation, the *r* which was to be written after *b* was written before *b* as well. The word *boot*, alongside [u], may have had [ʊ] or even [ʌ]; compare *foot* and *blood* (p. 168). The term *plosive* (p. 177) is obviously a misnomer when applied to "unexploded *t*" (p. 181); the author would have done better to call these sounds stops throughout, as he does on p. 187. *Moli* for *mollify* hardly exemplifies loss of *f* between vowels (p. 186); we have here rather an abbreviation of some kind, whether spoken or written. With the spelling *noting* for *nothing* (p. 187) compare Don Pedro's quibble in *Much Ado* ii. 3. 59. The [t] may have come in by contamination with the synonymous *nought*. The spellings *siz*, *twelf* exemplify loss of final *t* and should be transferred from pp. 187 f. to p. 181. The loss of *w* in *who* does not mean that *wh* has been "delabialized" (p. 201); the *h* is still pronounced with lip-rounding. The reference to Mark 6:9 on p. 207 should be to Mark 4:6.

- ✓ Professor John Whyte has given us a book on American speech which is of more than linguistic interest.<sup>18</sup> It is designed in particular for German migrants to this country, and deals primarily with mistakes in pronunciation, syntax, and diction which such would-be

<sup>18</sup> *American Words and Ways*, New York, The Viking Press, 1943, pp. xvi, 184, \$2.50.

users of American English might be expected to make, but in addition it gives to the migrants valuable information about American ways and attitudes. The author writes well and gives excellent advice. One could wish that he might use *linguist* and the like instead of *philologist* etc. (pp. 4, 37, 81), in accordance with the terminology usual among American specialists in this field. His generalization about southern speech (p. 5) is unwarranted; many southerners speak with a quick tempo and without drawl. Good idiom requires deletion of *with* on p. 71, line 5 from bottom. The British "leftenant" is an army pronunciation; no *f* is heard in the form used by the British navy (p. 82). It is inaccurate to say that we "have adopted the British *our* spelling only in the word the Saviour" (p. 83). We actually inherited the *our*-spellings just as did the British, but have kept the *u* (to some extent) in the word mentioned, while discarding it in *honor*, *harbor*, *neighbor*, etc. The last two words show that the suffix *our* is no automatic mark of French origin.

✓ Dr J. M. Clark's pamphlet on the English language<sup>10</sup> is pleasantly written but in the nature of the case adds nothing to our knowledge of the subject. Indeed, the author echoes once again some of the hoary falsities about language in general and English in particular, falsities repeated so often that their truth is taken for granted. I quote a characteristic passage (p. 21):

The tremendous vigour and vitality of Anglo-Saxon speech, mellowed somewhat by soft Celtic rhythms, reinforced by rugged Norse, merged in harmonious French, and completed by the subtle distinctions of Latin and Greek, have made English unique in its range of expression and its verbal resources.

We have here a series of misleading characterizations which lead up to a misleading conclusion. Elsewhere, speaking of language in general, Dr Clark tells us that "in a cultured state . . . schools maintain the correctness of the language and resist the tendency to disintegration," and this state of things he contrasts with "the crude dialect of primitive times" (p. 9). In fact, of course, the languages spoken in primitive societies are anything but crude, and the schools in cultured states have done harm rather than good in their efforts to "maintain the correctness of the language," while the tendency to disintegration (by which the author presumably

<sup>10</sup> *Our Language*, Glasgow, Craig & Wilson, 1943, pp. 63, 1 shilling.

means the tendency to break up into dialects) prevails or not in accordance with the amount of intercommunication in the given linguistic society, schools or no schools. In his sketch of the history of English the author misses the most important event: the change from a democratic to an aristocratic tongue, from a language of and for the people to a language which only a few (the highly educated) can ever hope to master. Much of the pamphlet is taken up with a discussion of the need for an international language and the prospects of English as such a language. In this connection spelling reform is considered, and as an alternative it is proposed to "change our pronunciation to make it correspond to the spelling," a suggestion first made (according to the author) by Sir Robert Bridges (p. 48). The pamphlet as a whole cannot be commended.

✓ Professor Kennedy's book on English usage has for subtitle "A Study in Policy and Procedure."<sup>20</sup> The author tells us that his study is "one of prescriptive tendency, in contradistinction to the descriptive writing of the scientific grammarian" (p. 4). He points out that "there are two approaches to the study of language, one the scientific, the other the artistic" (p. 3). His own approach was scientific in his earlier volume, *Current English*; it is artistic in the present work. As such it suffers chiefly from an inadequate treatment of style. Thus the distinction between the formal and the informal styles is confused with that between written and spoken English (pp. 52 ff.), despite certain qualifications which reveal that the author knows better. The term "colloquial" in particular is unhappy as a name for the informal style, even though "good" be prefixed. Most of what the author says, however, is well enough. I add a few comments on various matters. It is startling to find a would-be writer of formal English urged to make "his grammatical constructions . . . less idiomatic" (p. 53), but this goes with the author's prejudice against idioms, brought out later on (p. 95). He thinks of idioms as "highly individualistic" (in fact, they are nearly always communal and conventional), and as "ungrammatical expressions" in origin, though he wisely qualifies the latter generalization with "often" (p. 109). It is interesting to note that he classifies *it is me* among "idiomatic phrases" which "intrude gradually into" good colloquial speech (p. 55; cf. p.

<sup>20</sup> A. G. Kennedy, *English Usage*, New York, D. Appleton-Century, 1942, pp. xiv, 166.

110), but apparently does not think of *it is I* as an idiom at all, although surely the one is no more idiomatic than the other. There is no "voiced z-sound" in *reversion* (p. 78). In the note on hyphenation (p. 87), the best book, Miss A. M. Ball's *Compounding in the English Language* (New York, 1939), is not mentioned. Kennedy objects to the expression *That will be all right* on the ground that "all is used ambiguously inasmuch as it may be an adjective pointing back to the subject, or an adverb modifying that which follows" (p. 95). He objects strongly to the use of *most* 'nearly' (p. 95), and fails to mention the antiquity of this use (it goes back to OE times). In the same way, his condemnation of the conjunction *like* is not accompanied by any historical explanation (p. 99). The comment on Basic English (p. 108) overlooks one of the chief characteristics of that form of speech: the fewness of its verbs. In the list of English dictionaries (p. 149), I miss the *Shorter Oxford*, a work which should be given first place for those unable to buy the *NED* itself.

Dr Hart and Mr Lejeune have made a book useful in helping those not at home in Latin to get a better feeling for the Latin part of the English vocabulary.<sup>21</sup> The introductory note by G. M. A., however, reflects little credit on classical scholarship. Thus, the word *plum* is from OE *plume* (not *pluma*), and its Latin etymon is *prunum* (not *pruna*). We are also told that Latin was the language of the Church [of England] "from the ninth century to the sixteenth." Apparently G. M. A. is unaware that the Anglican Church goes back to A. D. 597, when the Roman mission sent out by Pope Gregory the Great landed in Kent. This important date ought to be better known.

Next we take up four doctoral dissertations in English linguistics.<sup>22</sup> Mr Meroney investigated the position of the so-called separable prefix *upp* in Old English, and came to the following conclusion:

<sup>21</sup> A. Hart and F. A. Lejeune, *The Latin Key to Better English*, New York, Dutton, 1942, pp. 226. \$2.

<sup>22</sup> H. M. Meroney, *Old English upp, uppe, uppan, and upon*, Chicago, 1943, pp. iv, 95; M. McD. Long, *The English Strong Verb from Chaucer to Causton*, Menasha, Wis., 1944, pp. xvi, 314; E. R. Williams, *The Conflict of Homonyms in English* (Yale Studies in English, 100), New Haven, 1944, pp. xii, 130; B. M. Charleston, *Studies on the Syntax of the English Verb* (Swiss Studies in English, 11), Bern, 1941, pp. x, 209.

If a prepositional phrase follows a verb-form other than a participle, *upp* most often precedes the phrase; otherwise, *upp* precedes participles regularly, infinitives and verbs in minor clauses usually, and with a good deal of irregularity verbs in main clauses having subject-verb ordering, but it follows imperative verbs and verbs in main clauses with verb-subject ordering [p. 38].

This conclusion is thoroughly documented and can hardly be challenged by future investigators. It has long been clear that the term "prefix" is a misnomer for *upp* and its fellows; these are separate words, and should be printed as such, even when they come before the verb-form. The present study makes the old terminology so preposterous that one may hope it will be widely if not generally given up. The author also investigates the position of *uppe* (pp. 59-61), and clarifies the use of *uppan*, *on uppan*, *upp on*, and *upon* (pp. 62-86). He rightly rejects the usual etymology of *upon*, and explains OE *up(p)on* "without the assumption that *upp* plus *on* underwent a coalescence of parts" (p. 84). His most important contribution, however, lies in the demonstration that a prepositional phrase influences the position of the adverbial particle. This dissertation is a first-rate piece of work. The author will presumably make like studies of the other adverbial particles hitherto called "separable prefixes." I have noted misprints on pp. 37 and 54.

Miss Long has collected enough examples of strong verb-forms in fifteenth-century English writings to make clear the changes that took place in the strong conjugation between Chaucer and Caxton. She lists all the strong verbs by classes, and gives under each verb as full an exhibit of variant forms as is needed to establish the development. For the convenience of the reader a summary of the changes in the mutation patterns is added (p. 263) and a more general summary of "characteristics and trends" (pp. 264-270) ends the text proper. She gives us three appendices: (1) statistical tables, (2) paradigms of preterit-present and anomalous verbs, and (3) a list of prefixes, together with the verbs made with each. The volume is concluded with an index of verbs. Miss Long has done her work with care, and her book fills a gap in our knowledge of the subject treated. Certain details might be better, as usually in dissertations and other books too numerous to mention. The long *e* of forms like *redin* 'ridden' is hardly a case of lowering (p. 3). For the word *dissyllabic* see the *NED*. The use of *ae* instead of *æ* in OE forms (pp. 112 ff.) is needless and objectionable.



Miss Long uses *ae* regularly in italics, but *æ* in roman if the vowel is long; otherwise, *ae*. Banta could have done better by her than that. The *came* cited from Jordan (p. 129) is plural, not singular. The explanation given for the *a* applies only to the quantity, but it is the quality which needs explaining. The past part. *wedyn* (p. 133) seems to be a weak preterit plural form, not a past participle at all. In the pret. forms of OE *sceafan* p. 197) the *o*, not the *e*, should be marked long. The verbs treated in Chap. VII (pp. 215 ff.) are not properly called reduplicating, for the most part; it would be better to call them simply Class VII. See E. Prokosch, *Comp. Gmc. Grammar*, pp. 176 ff.

Miss Williams, after a longish introduction (pp. 3-44) on homonymic conflict as a scientific hypothesis (theory, history, and methods), applies the theory in six studies: (1) *ear* and *near*, (2) *gate* 'gate-way' and *gate* 'road,' (3) ME. close and open long *e*, (4) *queen* and *quean*, (5) ME *ai*, and (6) *churn* and *chirm*. Throughout she proceeds with commendable caution, care, and thoroughness. All the possibilities are considered, and the evidence in most cases points clearly to homonymy as the primary factor in the loss of the word under discussion. It is not clear why the case of *queen* and *quean* was taken up apart from the other cases of ME close and open long *e*. In two passages (pp. 9 and 18) the author takes for granted a "strong influx" of French words into English in the eleventh century. In fact, this influx did not become really strong until the middle of the thirteenth century. The discussion of *axle* (p. 10) includes no mention of OE *ea xl*, a word which usually means 'shoulder' but clearly means 'cross-beam' in the compound *ea xl gespann* 'cross-beam attachment-place' (*Rood* 9). It is but a short step from cross-beam to axle-tree. ON *öxl* means both 'shoulder' and 'axle' and I believe OE *ea xl* likewise had both these meanings, even though the latter does not happen to be recorded. The tabu on the use of *ass* is far less strong today than it used to be (p. 21). It is hardly right to say that "the phonetic changes in German since OHG times have been comparatively few" (p. 22). OE *læn* 'loan' and OE *lean* 'reward' became homophones in the tenth century, not in the twelfth (p. 72). The *Beowulf* scribe in line 1809 misspells *læn* as *lean*, and there are other indications that *æ* and *ea* had been leveled under *æ* by the year 1000. Miss Williams once uses the word *homophone* (p. 52), and her investigation has to do

with mere homophony in most cases, though some of her cases exemplify homography as well, and thereby attain full homonymy. Systematic distinction of the terms *homophone*, *homograph*, and *homonym* is desirable in scientific writing.

Miss Charleston's investigation, in spite of its title, is limited to "the use of the finite verb in the early 18th century" (p. 1). It falls into three sections: (1) six chapters on "the time-spheres and the tenses," (2) three chapters on "the verbal aspects," and (3) three chapters on "the moods." There follow six pages of "conclusion," and in an appendix (pp. 173-202) the views of ten grammarians of the period "between 1685 and 1765" are summarized, the material being presented in three sections parallel to the sections of the author's study. This study is based primarily on essay periodicals like *The Spectator* and *The Rambler*, but the passages gathered from these sources were supplemented by passages from *Robinson Crusoe*, *Pamela*, *Clarissa Harlowe*, and *Tom Jones*. The dissertation was directed by Otto Funke, perhaps our leading authority on the language of the period, and on the linguistic theories then current in England. Under his capable supervision, Miss Charleston has done a sound piece of work. A study so broad, however, must rely on sampling rather than on exhaustive study of the evidence. In other words, the author has given us a survey of the field, not the detailed examination of a single point. Despite the author's competence, then, much more work needs to be done on the syntax of the verb before her results can be accepted without reserve. Any modifications which later research may make needful, however, will hardly affect the main lines of development as she has laid them out; they will sharpen or correct certain details. Thus, most of the examples of the perfect tense listed in Sec. 3.28 are explicable as denoting an action or state thought of as typical, and some of the participles of Sec. 3.17 seem to be adjectival.

The studies of Mr Andrew and Mr Anderson deal with Old English.<sup>23</sup> Mr Andrew's book seems to be an expansion of his papers on the same subject in *Medium Ævum* III and *Language* XII. The expansion, however, has not gone far enough. The

<sup>23</sup> S. O. Andrew, *Syntax and Style in Old English*, Cambridge: at the University Press, New York: The Macmillan Co., 1940, pp. viii, 112, \$2.50; O. S. Anderson, *Old English Material in the Leningrad MS of Bede's Ecclesiastical History*, Lund, 1941, pp. viii, 166, 3 plates.

author makes his points, gives a few illustrations, and passes on to other topics, without the thorough analysis and full discussion needed to settle the issues he raises. Until he can bring himself to make a really detailed investigation he should not expect his results to be accepted, or even to be taken seriously. Mr Anderson in his monograph has printed all the OE words in MS *L*, with the immediate Latin context. The only connected piece of OE is Cædmon's *Hymn*, which he prints along with the Latin paraphrase. For good measure he adds the version of the *Hymn* in the Moore MS. Comparison with Dobbie's text indicates that Anderson has left out a point in the MS at the end of line 4. He prints the *M* version with A. H. Smith's pointing, which obscures the meaning, as Anderson himself recognizes (p. 79). Though Dobbie's monograph on *Hymn* and *Death Song* came out in 1937, Anderson does not include it in his bibliography (p. 14). After the text (pp. 19-59) comes the discussion of the material, divided into etymological notes (pp. 63-79), orthography (pp. 80-88), phonology (89-123), notes on inflexion, date, and dialect (pp. 124-140), and conclusion "on the linguistic value of" *L* (pp. 141-145). He appends a glossary and an index of proper names. The author's discussion of *Streunæshalch* (p. 77) would have been better if he had read Menner's paper in *MLN* LIX 106-111. In his preface the author points out that "this is the first complete linguistic analysis of the Old English material in Bede." As such, it is the more valuable because of the care and accuracy with which it has been done. One looks forward to the "edition of the entire text" of *L* which the author hopes to make (p. vi).

Mr Clough's textbook on English grammar<sup>24</sup> is an attempt to use the inductive method of getting at the facts, and for sentence analysis it employs a handy set of symbols (as S, V, O for subject, verb, object) not unlike those of Jespersen. The author expresses himself well, and would have made a good book if he had stuck to induction throughout and had been more careful about his facts. As it stands, however, this textbook does not differ greatly from its competitors in the field. The author has not succeeded in getting away from traditional grammar, and he has made a number of mistakes, some of them serious. He slips up most noticeably when he leaves description for history. He thinks of the history of literary

<sup>24</sup> W. O. Clough, *The Science of Grammar*, Laramie, 1942, pp. viii, 155.

style in English as an evolution from "an almost primitive simplicity" (p. 139) to a state of things in which "every man may find a style to his own taste" (p. 142). In fact, of course, Old English, like modern English, had a variety of styles, and it would be hard to prove that the language has improved any, stylistically speaking, since the days of the *Beowulf* poet and Ælfric. "A simple, almost childlike style, held together with many *ands*" (p. 139), may be found in any period of English, and characterizes writers rather than periods. The author is mistaken in thinking that "a change of vowel within the word to show inflection is a characteristic of Germanic languages, but not of Latin and Romance languages" (p. 18; cf. p. 39). Compare French *pouvoir*, *puis*, *peux*; Latin *plebs*, *plēbis* and *ago*, *egi*. There is no OE adv. *slowe*; the modern *slow* adv. seems to have arisen on the analogy of *fast* (p. 21). The term *agglutinative* (p. 7) seems to be confused with *incorporating*. Of the six ME forms on p. 39, only two are correct. The -s which now marks the third sing. of the present tense marked the second sing. in OE (p. 39); some scholars, indeed, deny any connection with the OE ending. The explanation given (p. 46) for the use of auxiliary or periphrastic forms in verbal inflection is right enough in a way: Old English had but two tenses, a present and a preterit. But the further point that "Old English seemed inadequate for full translation of Latin or for other demands upon it" implies that auxiliaries and the like were unknown in the earliest forms of English. In fact they go back to prehistoric times. We still have but two tenses, and these we eke out by using auxiliaries, much (though not wholly) as of old. The inadequacy which the author speaks of was felt (and remedied) in Old English times, but it was a matter of vocabulary, not of morphology or syntax. Prepositional phrases are common, not only "in English and other modern European languages" (p. 53), but in the languages of antiquity (e.g. Latin, Greek, and Germanic) as well. They are much used in Old English, which, for the noun at least, has a very meager system of case inflection. The author seems to think that the "omission" of the relative particle is a development of modern times (p. 63). Compare Curme, *Syntax*, p. 233, where it is called "the most primitive type of relative construction." The author's insistence upon *whom* (pp. 63, 87) goes counter to his inductive approach; contrast the dictum (based on induction) of the

*NED*: "the objective case of *who*: no longer current in natural colloquial speech." The form *she* is from OE *heo*, not *seo* (p. 84). The -s of *hers* etc. comes from *his*, not from "the common genitive form of the noun" (p. 85). The bibliography wrongly states that Jespersen's *Essentials of English Grammar* is "based on the great *Philosophy of Grammar*" (p. 149). It is actually based on *A Modern English Grammar*, Jespersen's chief work in the English field.

Professor Thorndike's study, in spite of its modest title, is a valuable piece of research.<sup>25</sup> The author says in his introduction: "For some years I have been working on a teacher's reference book on suffixes. . . . It now seems unlikely that I shall have either the time or the facilities to complete this work, and I therefore report here certain of the facts which are ready, and certain conclusions which the completed work would almost certainly substantiate." It is to be hoped that the work may after all be completed, for the sample here given shows how badly it is needed. We all know, vaguely enough, that the treatment of suffixes in dictionaries and other works of reference is unsatisfactory, but it takes an investigation like Thorndike's to show in detail how poorly we are served. No student of word-formation in English can afford to neglect this unpretentious volume, aimed at school-teachers but full of meat for professional linguists too.

During the period under review the Linguistic Society of America has published one monograph and seven dissertations.<sup>26</sup> It has also brought out some special publications, as part of the work on foreign language study prompted by the Intensive Language Program of the American Council of Learned Societies, work done primarily for the United States Armed Forces Institute.<sup>27</sup> Bloomfield's *Guide* is an

<sup>25</sup> E. L. Thorndike, *The Teaching of English Suffixes*, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York, 1941, pp. viii, 81, \$1.60.

<sup>26</sup> R. A. Hall, Jr., *Hungarian Grammar*, 1944, pp. 91; P. Scherer, *Germanic-Balto-Slavic Etyma*, 1941, pp. 63; J. H. D. Allen, Jr., *Portuguese Word-Formation with Suffixes*, 1941, pp. 143; W. G. Moulton, *Swiss German Dialect and Romance Patois*, 1941, pp. 75; J. L. Rose, *The Durative and Aoristic Tenses in Thucydides*, 1942, pp. 49; A. G. Vaughan, *Latin Adjectives with Partitive Meaning in Republican Literature*, 1942, pp. 70; J. J. Gavigan, *The Syntax of the Gesta Francorum*, 1943, pp. 102; W. Cornyn, *Outline of Burmese Grammar*, 1944, pp. 34.

<sup>27</sup> L. Bloomfield, *Outline Guide for the Practical Study of Foreign Languages*, 1942, pp. 16; B. Bloch and G. L. Trager, *Outline of Linguistic*

admirable set of elementary instructions for the would-be learner of a language. If such a learner follows Bloomfield's guidance, he will get on much faster and learn more and better than is possible by using the ordinary school-room technic. Yet there is nothing startling about the instructions; they are the fruit of common sense applied to this particular matter. If they seem novel, it is only because common sense plays so small a part in traditional linguistic instruction. The Bloch-Trager *Outline* has like virtues: it gives plain, lucid explanations of many things familiar to the expert but not so well known to the neophyte. Now and again, however, the authors get into controversial territory, where in the nature of the case (their space being severely limited) they cannot deal adequately with the points at issue, and must present their own views dogmatically, or at any rate with little attention to contrary views. The booklet falls into five chapters: language and linguistics (5 pp.), phonetics (28 pp.), phonemics (15 pp.), morphology (18 pp.), and syntax (9 pp.). The authors wisely treat derivation as well as inflection under morphology. The section on the suffix *-ous*, and nearly all the chapter on syntax, "were written in first draft by Professor Leonard Bloomfield" (p. 4). The phonetic chapter is notable for a new system of vowel transcription; it provides for seven degrees of openness instead of the three degrees (high, mid, and low) of the Bell-Sweet system. Otherwise the Bell-Sweet scheme is kept, with the substitution of the term "central" for "mixed." Many of the 42 vowel symbols are new, or, if old, have new values. The researches of the instrumental phoneticians seem to have had little influence on the authors, whose phonetics strike one as distinctly old-fashioned, despite the innovations in transcription symbols. A curious detail is the refusal to recognize consonantal [ə] as a semivowel because it has "a lower tongue position than the contiguous syllabic" (p. 23). Even though this consonant is "not usually called" a semivowel it deserves recognition as such, since it, like the other semivowels, is a speech-sound made like a vowel but consonantal in function. And in their phonemic chapter the authors reverse themselves and classify the consonantal [ə] of English as a semivowel, although

*Analysis*, 1942, pp. 82; R. A. Hall, Jr., *Melanesian Pidgin English*, 1943: Grammar, Texts, Vocabulary, pp. 159, Phrase-Book and Vocabulary, pp. 28. Other books of this kind exist, but have not come to *MLN*.



they do so by a strange route: they identify it with [h]. Such juggling shows how little respect the authors have for phonetic realities.

The phonemic chapter, after a good exposition along the usual lines, ends with a phonemic analysis of English which has at any rate the virtue of novelty: the authors go D. Jones one better by reducing to six the number of "vowel-letters"<sup>28</sup> needed for scientific transcription. They accomplish this feat by interpreting the glides and long vowels of English as diphthongs: combinations of short vowel and semivowel. Most of these analyses are old, it is true, however unsound phonetically. Thus, transcriptions like /aj, aw, ij, uw, ej, ow/ for the more usual [ai, au, i:, u:, ei or e:, ou or o:] are not unfamiliar. But the classification of [h] as a semivowel is certainly new, as is its identification with the latter half of the long vowels [a:, ɔ:, ə:] and with consonantal [ə]. The following transcriptions show how the system works: *calm*, *caught*, *burr* /kahm, koht, bəhr /; *beer*, *bear*, *bore*, *boor* /bihr, behr, bohr, buhr /; *dearer*, *Mary*, *story*, *Jewry* /dihrər, mehrij, stohrij, džuhrij /. In the Bloch-Trager system of English phonemes, /h/ does triple duty: it covers (1) the aspirate, (2) the "lengthening element" of the long vowels, and (3) consonantal [ə]. But the authors seem to interpret consonantal [ə] as /h/ in one position only: that before /r/. At any rate, they do not give *real* /rihl/ as an example in their table (p. 52, /Vh/ column). But perhaps they would transcribe it /rijl/.

In this system the sonantal liquids, nasals, and semivowels<sup>29</sup> are treated variously. The symbol /ə/ serves, not only to represent the sonantal semivowel [ə], but also to mark as sonantal a following liquid or nasal; thus, *beaten* is transcribed /bijtən/, a form in which the /ə/ is really silent, serving only to mark the following /n/ as sonantal rather than consonantal. The sonantal semivowel [w] is transcribed in three ways: with /u/, as in *educate*; with /ow/, as in *window*; and with /uw/, as in *value* (p. 50). Similarly, the sonantal semivowel [y]<sup>30</sup> is transcribed in three ways: with /ij/, as in *carry*, *candied*; with /i/, as in *candid*,

<sup>28</sup> *English Pronouncing Dictionary*, p. xi (Sec. 16).

<sup>29</sup> For these, see my paper in *MLQ* III 5-8.

<sup>30</sup> For [y] rather than [j] see my paper just cited. I agree with Bloch and Trager (*Outline*, p. 22) in preferring [ü] for the vowel.

*handed, roses*; and with /e/, as in *handed, roses* (variant pronunciation). These variants of [w] and [y] seem to me to be phonetic rather than phonemic, in spite of occasional oppositions like *candied, candid* in some dialects (not in mine). But the difficulties under which the authors labor must be recognized. They are in the grip of *systemzwang*. The system which they have set up compels them to interpret every unstressed sonant as an allophone of some stressed sonant. The outcome is no more variegated than one would expect. In my paper in *Studies for W. A. Read* (1940) I tried to do the same thing, and I did little better at it than Bloch and Trager have done here. In my paper of 1942 (*MLQ* III) I took another tack, with eminently satisfactory results. The unstressed sonants, so troublesome when tied to stressed sonants, fall beautifully into place when interpreted as allophones of the liquids, nasals, and semivowels.

The interpretation of the glides and long vowels as diphthongs goes counter to sound phonetic analysis and cannot be accepted. There is a fundamental difference between a true diphthong like *oi*, actually made up of the two phonemes [ɔ] and [y], and a glide like [ai], itself a phoneme.<sup>31</sup> The authors also go astray on the affricates, which they wrongly take to be "clusters," even going so far as to say that "medially and finally, the sounds in question behave exactly like such unmistakable clusters as /ts, dz/ and /tr, dr/; compare *Patsy* and *hatchet*, . . ." (p. 49). Yet if we do as the authors ask and compare *Patsy* and *hatchet* we see at once that here /ts/ and /tʃ/ behave differently: in *Patsy* the *t* belongs to the first syllable, the *s* to the second, but even Bloch and Trager would hardly claim that *hatchet* falls into *hat* and *shet*. Again, when affrication takes place in sandhi, as *right here* [rai-tʃiər], the division into syllables is so made that the affricate remains intact, regardless of the morphemic boundary. But the syllable does not loom large in the Bloch-Trager *Outline*. I have left myself no space to discuss the last two chapters. I have noted misprints on pp. 21, 69, 75.

Professor Hall's two books on Melanesian Pidgin differ markedly. The short book is done in a highly elementary, popular way. It begins with a "grammar" of four pages; then come nine pages of useful phrases, listed and translated; then a six-page Pidgin-to-

<sup>31</sup> See my discussion in *English Studies* XVIII (1936) 160, note 4.

English vocabulary; and finally an eight-page English-to-Pidgin vocabulary. The longer book (dedicated to Bloomfield) is a strictly scientific piece of work. The outline of grammar takes pp. 12-44. Then come the texts, with translations (pp. 45-87), followed by the Pidgin-to-English (pp. 88-125) and the English-to-Pidgin (126-157) vocabularies. The volume ends with a one-page bibliography and a one-page appendix (suggestions for practical use). The author in his introduction insists that his work "must not be considered as more than a preliminary sketch." He prepared and wrote the book in this country, with the aid of English-speaking (not Melanesian) informants. So far as I can judge, he has done an admirable job within the limits set by the circumstances. Our soldiers have been well served.

Professor Schlauch's "popular introduction to the science of language" (blurb)<sup>22</sup> reads well, and in many ways meets the need for a work of vulgarization in this field. The author herself has the gift of tongues; she is at home in many languages, ancient and modern. One would have thought her exceptionally well qualified to write such a book. Unluckily the work as it stands cannot be commended without serious reservations, because of the many mistakes to be found in it. Limitations of space keep me from mentioning more than a few of these mistakes. Stops are said to be so called "because they are stopped quickly and cannot be prolonged" (p. 22; cf. p. 10), and 12 other sounds "made in approximately the same positions" are called continuants "because they do lend themselves to prolongation." Yet on p. 173 the author mentions Italian *notte* etc. and explains that "the doubled consonant is actually prolonged in speech" (cf. p. 185). The stops [p, b] are said to be "made by blowing the lips apart" (p. 20). In fact, of course, they are made by closing the lips; the blowing apart marks the transition to the next sound. The sounds [s, z] are said to be "made on the hard palate" (p. 23). The discussion of alphabets (pp. 39 f.) does not bring out the fact that the Semitic and Hindu "alphabets" were really syllabaries; see H. Pedersen, *Ling. Science*, pp. 180, 191. It was not the Romans but the Ionians who "used *H* for a new purpose" (p. 40). The runic alphabet on p. 42 is the older, Germanic form, not the later, Scandinavian form. The word

<sup>22</sup> Margaret Schlauch, *The Gift of Tongues*, New York, Modern Age, 1942, pp. x, 342, \$3.50.

for "I" in modern Icelandic is *jeg*, not *ek* (p. 50). It is strange to read that "when Middle English emerged as the accepted national speech," presumably in the fourteenth century, its vocabulary was marked by "an overwhelming numerical majority of French loans" (pp. 95 f.).

The author continues with a misleading passage about linguistic and literary conditions in England during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries:

The overlord could not be expected to learn the barbarous dialect (as it would appear to him) of the native English peasants. Nor could he be expected to study and revere the admirable literature that had been produced in the subject speech (p. 96).

In fact, the nobility and gentry of England were for the most part bilingual in those days. Few of those who came over from France ever learned much English, but their children picked it up much as they picked up French (though from different people); that is a way children have. Neither language was a subject of formal study, of course. Nor did anybody dream of studying either English or French literature. Indeed, the upper classes did not pursue literary studies at all, except for those in holy orders and a handful of eccentrics. As late as 1685, if one goes by Macaulay's famous description (*Hist. of England*, Chap. III), the squires of England were essentially a class of illiterates. In 1185 their culture would hardly have been on a higher level. Actually they were, at that time, illiterates in the strictest sense: few of them could either read or write in any tongue. King Alfred and his aristocracy are quite exceptional in the annals of medieval Europe. The discussion on pp. 205 ff. is equally misleading.

Instead of the clumsy "portmanteau words" (p. 103) the author should have used the term *blends*. Of the examples given, *socialite* and *renovated* are not blends but puns. As French *aventure* became German *abenteuer* by phonetic processes, the author's clever explanation in terms of popular etymology (p. 104) is hardly right. On p. 111 delete the words between "*rump*" and *parliament*. The sketch of the history of *breeches*, *pant(aloon)s*, and *trousers* (p. 118) is wrong. The term *undertaker* (p. 118) arose as a pun, though it got into serious use as a euphemism. The author is too optimistic when she says that English "would be easy in every way" if it had "a rational system of spelling" (p. 137). The change from *Gemini* to *Jiminy* is hardly a case of assimilation (p. 174). The form

*Geeminy* (*Jeeminy*) shows that the oath got a "long *e*" by association with *Jesus* (the stronger oath for which it was euphemistically substituted). From *Geeminy* comes *Jiminy* by shortening of [i:] to [i], a perfectly normal phonetic process in a trisyllabic word with stress on the antepenult. The *re* of *irresistible* shows the same shortening (p. 174), though here it is due to want of stress. The *b* of *timber* (p. 175) is original. The development of a stop between a nasal and a liquid is not properly classified under dissimilation (p. 175). The *b* of *marble* (F *marbre* < L *marmor*) is a case of dissimilation: *m..m* > *m..b* (p. 175). The Russians did not invent the pronunciation of *au*, *eu* as *av*, *ev*; they got it from the Greeks (p. 179). At no time were the particles *the* and *a* "pronounced with long vowels exclusively" (p. 180). Instead of the clumsy *monophthongization* (p. 181) why not say *smoothing* with Sweet? The modern pronunciation of *could* presumably goes back to ME *coude* [ku:də], not to a diphthongal form (p. 182). The *t* sometimes added to *once* is to be connected, not with *first* (p. 183), but with *whilst*, *against*, etc. The [y] of *car* [kya:] does not lie "between a back consonant and a front vowel" (p. 184), but between a palatal consonant and a velar vowel. Russian *chai* 'tea' is presumably from Mandarin Chinese *ch'a* or the like, not from Amoy dialectal *t'e* (p. 185). The phoneme [l] is never a vowel (p. 188), though often a sonant. The classification of speech-sounds as consonants and sonants, on the basis of syllabicity, should always be kept distinct from their classification as vowels, stops, nasals, etc., on the basis of method of formation. German *Schwundstufe* is properly put into English as 'nil grade' or 'zero grade,' not as "vanishing gradation" (p. 190). Of the OE noun declensions (p. 196), only three have many nouns in them; the others are mere relics of declensions important in Old Germanic or Indo-European times. The author recognizes both close and open long *e* but only close long *o* in Middle English (p. 207). Her use of *philologist* and *philology* (pp. 226, 230) instead of *linguist* and *linguistics* is unhappy. No cultivated southerner would say [po:k, mo:] for *pork*, *more*. This pronunciation is a prerogative of the uncultured; for the standard pronunciation see Kenyon-Knott. Some southerners of cultivation, however, pronounce words like *coat*, *moan* with a spurious *r*, saying [ko:ət, mo:ən] instead of the historical [ko:t, mo:n]. The spurious *r* was presumably inserted by hypercorrectness to begin with; by now such pronunciations have

become traditional. Moreover, many southerners of cultivation use *don't* for *doesn't*. The author's discussion of these matters shows unawareness of the facts (p. 272). I have noted misprints on pp. 26, 52, 124, 176.

Mr Bodmer's volume on linguistics<sup>33</sup> is like Miss Schlauch's in that the author tries to make his subject interesting to the general public. But Mr. Bodmer has other goals as well. His book "is at the same time a history of language, a guide to foreign tongues and a method for learning them" (blurb). The work falls into four parts: "the natural history of language, our hybrid heritage, the world language problem, and language museum." The fourth part is made up of "basic vocabularies" for learning (1) Germanic languages, (2) Romance languages, and (3) "Greek roots in common use for technical words of international currency." The other three parts are done in narrative style, though sprinkled with tables, drawings, and pictures. A 30-page introductory chapter tells one how to use the book. The editor in his two-page foreword points out that *The Loom* "is a successor to *Mathematics for the Million* and *Science for the Citizen*" and emphasizes the fact that "its motif is social and its bias is practical." He might have added that *The Loom* agrees with its predecessors in having an alliterative title. This fondness for alliteration also crops up in the title of Part Two. This part has a sub-title, "A Cook's tour round the Teutonic and Romance groups," which illustrates the style of the book as a whole. The author does not always stick to linguistics; he puts in not a few jabs at religion, capitalism, and other things he dislikes. As a handbook for learning a foreign language, *The Loom* cannot be commended. Trying to learn several Germanic or Romance languages at once, as the author would have the student do, will bring confusion rather than mastery. New languages ought to be tackled one at a time. A layman who wants a "Cook's tour" of the linguistic world might find worse guides than Mr Bodmer, but he would have to be on his guard and take nothing on faith, since, together with a flood of good things, he would get false pieces of information like the following: Russian ч is pronounced [dʒ] (p. 46); the sound [ð] exists only in "Teutonic languages" (p. 66); "the Russian alphabet . . . has eight . . . vowel symbols"

<sup>33</sup> F. Bodmer, *The Loom of Language* (Lancelot Hogben, ed.), New York, Norton, 1944, pp. x, 692, \$3.75.



(p. 68); "voice flexion never existed" in English (p. 82); "at an early date the hard Germanic *g* of English softened to *y*" (p. 97); etc., etc.

The well-known Anglicist, Professor J. Hoops, has added two studies of linguistic interest to his long list of publications.<sup>34</sup> The paper on Shakespeare deals with the history and etymology of the name; it is a revision and expansion of Hoops' contribution to the *Studies for W. A. Read* (Baton Rouge, 1940). The paper on the history of the olive tree, though not primarily linguistic, deals at length with the names which this tree went by in various tongues old and new. In particular, there is a full discussion of the difficult Gothic *alew*, a problem which the learned author is forced to leave unsolved.

We turn now to three studies in the semantic field.<sup>35</sup> Professor Stevenson has written a book of the first importance. It deals with ethics from the point of view of a professional philosopher who is concerned "to clarify the meaning of the ethical terms—such terms as *good*, *right*, *just*, *ought*," etc.—and "to characterize the general methods by which ethical judgments can be proved or supported" (p. 1). Both these aims involve linguistic study, of course, and by his title the author plays up the linguistic side of his investigations. It must be added, however, that he gives us nothing new in this field as such. His contribution lies in extending to the methodology of "normative ethics" certain linguistic commonplaces hitherto neglected though not wholly ignored by the philosophical tribe. His book is richly freighted with other intellectual goods, too, but here we must limit ourselves to its semantic side. Now and then the author's terminology is bad (e. g. "philological change," p. 40), but his treatment of semantic problems is sane and informed. Thus, in distinguishing between the descriptive and the emotive meaning of *good* and the like he rightly lays emphasis (pp. 76 ff.) on the legitimacy and functional importance of the emotive meaning. For the professional linguist the most interesting chapter will be that on "persuasive definitions" (pp. 207 ff.); here, oddly

<sup>34</sup> *Shakespeares Name und Herkunft*, Heidelberg, 1941, pp. 56; *Geschichte des Ölbaums*, Heidelberg, 1944, pp. 95.

<sup>35</sup> C. L. Stevenson, *Ethics and Language*, New Haven, Yale Univ. Press, 1944, pp. xii, 338, \$4; S. I. Hayakawa, *Language in Action*, New York, Harcourt, Brace, 1941, pp. x, 245, \$2; F. A. Philbrick, *Understanding English*, New York, Macmillan, 1942, pp. xiv, 209, \$1.50.

enough, the author failed to mention etymology, though definitions based on etymology are the most persuasive of all and are often used in support of ethical judgments. Few etymologists realize how practical their field is, how great a part it plays in everyday life! I have noted misprints on pp. 83, 90, 92, 153; the misspelling *vigourously* on p. 281 may or may not be a misprint.

Mr Philbrick's book has the sub-title "An Introduction to Semantics," and the same sub-title might properly have been given to Mr Hayakawa's book. Both these volumes are textbooks aimed at beginners; Mr Philbrick's is specifically designed for courses in freshman English. It would be unreasonable to expect in either work any contributions to knowledge. As introductions to semantics they are markedly different, though both, of course, deal with much the same matter. Mr Hayakawa's is more readable, and less academic in effect. Mr Philbrick's has a richer intellectual quality. Both books may safely be commended to anyone who wishes to make a start in semantic studies.

We end this survey with brief mention of Professor G. T. Flom's monograph on *The Morphology of the Dialect of Aurland*.<sup>30</sup> The old master here adds another member to his series of studies on the dialect of this parish in Sogn, Norway. Earlier studies are that on the placenames and that on the phonology; the latter had the honor of beginning the *Illinois Studies*, in 1915. The author has been working on the language of Aurland parish since 1912; it is good to have his collections on the inflectional system put in permanent form and made available to the scholarly world. The study describes the modern dialect but has a special interest for the medievalist, since, as the author observes, this dialect "preserves to an unusual degree the characteristics of the declensions and conjugations of the old language" (p. 5). It is to be hoped that the author will be spared to crown his work on this dialect by the dictionary to which he refers (*loc. cit.*). In any case, he has earned the gratitude and admiration of all workers in this and related fields.

KEMP MALONE

*The Johns Hopkins University*

---

<sup>30</sup> *Illinois Studies in Language and Literature* xxix, 4. Urbana, 1944, pp. 142. \$2 (paper), \$2.50 (cloth).

## REVIEWS

*The Concept 'Sage' in Nibelungen Criticism. The History of the Conception of 'Sage' in the Nibelungen Criticism from Lachmann to Heusler.* By ELISABETH EDROP BOHNING. Dissertation, Bryn Mawr College, 1944. (Times Publishing Company, Bethlehem, Penna.) Pp. ix, 11-254.

Whoever is interested in the history of the NL-studies will gladly reach for the above dissertation, which deals with that specific chapter in NL-research which one is tempted to call 'the Lachmann interlude.' For it is the 'Lachmann school' that is held responsible for the well-known 'Lieder- und Sagentheorie' which occupied the best minds of three generations in a heated fight of at best moderate usefulness. Without touching the question of manuscript criticism, treated recently by M. Thorpe in her *Study of the Nibelungenlied*, this book surveys, analyzes, and catalogues in eight hundred and forty-four chronologically arranged paragraphs (pp. 11-194) all those contributions to the NL-study which were made between the years 1816 (1753) and 1940. One cannot but admire the consistency, accuracy and skill with which the author disentangles that confusing labyrinth of hypotheses, negations, syntheses and surmises which resulted from the accumulated opinions of some five hundred and fifty scholars. The bibliography alone, culled from over a thousand books and periodicals, covers fifty pages and is arranged chronologically at the end of the book (pp. 195-246). We review early speculations as to the authorship of the NL (e.g. Konrad, Marner, Konrad v. W., Wolfram, Ofterdingen, Klingsor, Walther, Rudolf v. E., Kürenberger); we observe the impact made by the 'Liedertheorie' and the ensuing discussions of 'Lieder and Sagen' by the Lachmann school; we witness the gradual formation of speculations about historic origins (prototypes and parallels); we follow the theories or, rather, fancies concerning a mythical origin (Siegfried: Odin, Baldr, Freyr) and nature myth (seasonal, diurnal) in German and comparative mythology; we see the development of the 'Märchentheorie,' with the Siegfried-story reflected in fairy tale and folklore. A chapter on 'poetic invention,' finally, collects evidence from Goethe to Heusler to show the existence of an individual poet and his importance for the formation of the legend. It paves the way for the final chapter, a survey of Heusler's theories, which are presented in reverse order: poetic invention, 'Märchen,' myth, historic origin, tradition, and authorship.

Although the problems discussed by the author are avowedly treated in the light of Heusler's theories—it might be too strong to

call him the alpha and omega of this study—, this investigation is characterized by a remarkable impartiality in the presentation of the varying opinions, particularly when it echoes the bitterness (and unfairness) of personal feuds. A minor point to which one may object, is an off-hand remark which calls Schröfl's interpretation of the *Not* 'fantastic' and 'not . . . taken seriously' (p. 76). No doubt, Schröfl has his adherents, and his opinions have been taken seriously, as the author herself bears out in various citations.

It is quite understandable that given one thousand titles of books and magazines a few typographical errors should have crept in, e. g. read p. vii *alles Vorhandene*; p. 17 *gründlicher*; p. 167 *Ansicht*; p. 190 *gefühlsmässig*; p. 195 *teutonicorum*; p. 203 *Poesie*; p. 208 *pugnam*; p. 124 *altera*; p. 221 *Littérature*; p. 222 *Nibelunghi.*; p. 230 *Matthias*; p. 237 *Sagas*; p. 243 *Dt. Vierteljahrschrift*. On p. 11 (*Klage* 4315) the period between *Getihtet man ez sît hat* and *Dicke in tiutscher zungen* is disturbing and should be placed up a line. An index of authors comprising some five hundred and fifty names enhances the value of this study; D. B. Schumway (*The NL*, 1909), L. Levillain ("Les Nib. hist. et leurs alliances de famille," *Ann. du Midi*, 1938), and H. Grégoire ("La patrie des Nib.," *Byzantion*, 1934) might have been included. Many a student would have welcomed an *Index rerum* to facilitate the tracing of problems. The few missing books and periodicals, for which the author apologizes, are certainly of no consequence, as e. g. A. Martin's "*Pilier . . . de Frisingue*," called 'inaccessible' (p. 207), which is available in the New York Public Library.

As one lays aside this important investigation modestly called by its author "a general survey to describe how these Romantic misconceptions originated, grew and spread," creating "a great web of error, speculations and fancy (p. vii, viii)," one is reminded of similar harm done by the same Lachmann school in the related field of OG text editions, and what Heusler accomplished in NL-criticism—"he disturbed the Romantic fiction (p. vii)"—Paul-Wilhelm did in textual criticism. Only in one point, which is a matter of opinion and but loosely related to the main problem, one may disagree with the author: she believes in the final solution of the NL-problems by Heusler's theories (p. 194). In view of the disappointing and costly Lachmann interlude, so ably presented in this work, Heusler signifies more the beginning of the 'Nibelungenliedforschung' than its end.

CARL SELMER

Hunter College

*The Romance of Daude de Pradas called Dels Auzels Cassadors*, edited with Introduction, Summary, Notes, and Glossary by ALEXANDER HERMAN SCHUTZ (Contributions in Languages and Literature, No. 11, Romance Language Series). Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 1945. Pp. xii + 225. \$5.00.

This thirteenth-century treatise on falconry (the only one extant in Provençal) is here edited for the first time completely and critically. The text is accompanied by an English version, part summary and part translation. In the Introduction, Professor Schutz discusses the MSS. of the poem, previous (partial or uncritical) editions, the author, the versification, etc. The book also contains a few notes and a small glossary; both of these sections are concerned primarily with words or usages peculiar to falconry.

The poem enumerates and describes the various kinds of hunting hawks, tells how to catch and train them, and suggests remedies for their diseases and injuries. Modern adepts of the sport may regret that the translation is incomplete. But Daude's poem will have for them less interest than the longer, more authoritative *Art of Falconry* of his contemporary Frederick II, recently published by Wood and Fyfe. Frederick's discussions are fuller, his scope more ample. It would seem, by the way, that the practice of hooding birds, which Frederick claims to have introduced from the East, had not reached Daude's ears; for he makes no mention of it. Perhaps the most valuable part of Daude's work is that on diseases of birds, with which Frederick does not deal. Unfortunately, along with perfectly sound methods of healing, there are presented a number of fantastic remedies, such as feeding the birds a hen fed on wheat boiled with snakes, or a bat stuffed with pepper. These have the virtue, as Professor Schutz says, of injecting unintended humor into the poem. Some may find humor in the recommendation that neither drunkards nor lovers own hawks, for the birds suffer from the offensive breath of the former and the neglect of the latter. It is also rather amusing to find Daude, the Christian churchman, telling his readers how to disguise another man's hawk so cleverly that they can keep it for themselves; a certain Persian treatise on hawking deplores the dishonesty of such practice. Voltaire would have liked that.<sup>1</sup> The language of the poem is clear and natural, the versification (octosyllabic rimed couplets) smooth; but I think no one would call it great poetry. Daude was no more a Vergil than he was a Frederick II.

There are three complete MSS. of the poem: one in the Vatican, one at Vich, and one in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. In addition, there is a fragmentary MS. (ll. 2751-2948) at Sutri. Professor Schutz bases his text on the Vatican MS., as being

<sup>1</sup> I am indebted for some of these suggestions to my colleague, Dr. Thomas H. Rawles, who has had considerable experience in falconry.

closest to Daude's own spelling and language; but he corrects faulty versification, etc., from the others. As one might expect from this editor, the text is scholarly and convincing, the other sections of the book competent and adequate. Professor Schutz has evidently taken pains to familiarize himself with the technical details of the subject, and explains those passages which would cause trouble for one not so versed. Even so, an occasional note or a question mark in the translation reminds us of the gaps in our knowledge of Provençal.

There are a few misprints or oversights: (1) p. 30, last line, read "an old duck," not "and old duck"; (2) p. 38, LXVII, the word *auca*, which I know only as "goose," is translated "duck"; (3) p. 40, LXXXIII, first sentence, the word "not" is omitted (text: *non es ges una res*); (4) l. 890, is *ses* a misprint for *ses* (translation: "without")?

My interpretation, in a couple of places, would differ from that of the editor: (1) l. 129, does not *lo ponh* refer rather to the hand of the falconer than to the toes of the bird? One moves the bird (seated on one's hand) sharply up and down, then turns the hand this way and that, to see if the bird balances itself properly. (2) l. 1063, would it not be better to read *o'om* for *com*, and translate "and does not wait (*agara*) until one has come up to it," rather than "does not even go for it until it comes right up to the falcon"? (3) l. 3428, I am not quite sure what the editor means by "powdered azure" for *azurs qui-l polveris*; since this treatment is alternative to powdered gold, I suspect that lapis lazuli, rather than a dye, is intended.

I trust that these few comments will not put the reviewer outside the ranks of "the *gen corteza*, to whom, after the manner of his poet, the present editor commends himself."

FRANK McMINN CHAMBERS

Northwestern University

---

*The Letters of Mary W. Shelley.* Edited by FREDERICK L. JONES.  
Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1944.  
2 Vols.: xxxii + 379, xx + 390 pp. \$12.00.

This is by far the most comprehensive collection of Mary Shelley's letters yet compiled. The editor remarks: "All the available correspondence of Mary Shelley is collected in these volumes. Approximately half of it has never been printed before. Many other letters are known to exist, and in some instances just what they are is known. Information about these unavailable letters will be found either in the text or in Appendix I. If every scrap of the correspondence still lurking in family archives and in private collections were accessible, it is extremely doubtful that publication of the whole would be practical. The most valuable letters, those written in Shelley's lifetime, are probably about as complete in number as they are likely ever to be."



The letters hitherto unpublished have mainly to do with the period subsequent to Shelley's death and are many of them to Claire Clairmont, Trelawny, Maria Gisborne, and others of the Shelley circle. Chiefly they serve to define more clearly the character of Mary herself, for though they are of slight literary importance per se, they tell of Mary's industry as a literary hack, her struggle to support her son and to give him all advantages, and her ever-fresh interest in young men of literary talent—sometimes to her cost in money and reputation.

The widowed Mary Shelley was not a happy woman but she faced her life with courage. Some of her conduct as revealed in her letters was rather foolish but not base, and her devotion to her friends and to her son was unselfish. Most of her friends and relations—her father, her step-mother, Claire, Jane Williams, and even Leigh Hunt and Trelawny—repaid her rather shabbily or at best coldly for her friendly approaches. She had no genius for friendship and appeared cold when she was not so at heart. It is pleasant to know that both her son and her daughter-in-law saw beneath the surface, loved her devotedly, and were heart-broken at her death.

Mary Shelley was throughout her life devoted to her husband's memory. No one was ever comparable to him and she forever reproached herself for her partial failure in sympathy and understanding during the last two years of his life. She had not made him happy and too late she realized her failure. Yet in these letters the real reason is apparent: she had little real sympathy with liberal ideas and without being wholly mercenary or socially ambitious she was forever preoccupied with trivial material things. She spent much of her time and strength in writing fiction and compiling hack biographies, but seldom is there revealed in her later letters a gleam of intellectual curiosity. Only under Shelley's direct influence—and then not continuously—could she live above herself and prove an adequate intellectual companion to him.

The book is scrupulously and admirably edited. Everything is given that the most exacting scholarship could demand and the utmost pains and care have been lavished upon it. Also it is a beautiful piece of bookmaking of which the University of Oklahoma Press can be justly proud.

CARL GRABO

*University of Chicago*

---

### BRIEF MENTION

---

*The Voice of Norway.* By HALVDAN KOHT and SIGMUND SKARD. New York: Columbia University Press, 1944. Pp. xii + 313. \$3.50. This useful book falls into two parts: "Free men build their society," by Koht (pp. 1-116), and "Life unfolds in literature," by Skard (pp. 117-296). Part I is a political, Part II a literary history of Norway. The political part is good, so far as I can judge, but the readers of this journal, like the reviewer, will be chiefly interested in the literary part, a miracle of compression and interpretation which inspires me with enthusiastic admiration. Dr. Skard has written the best short history of Norwegian literature I have ever read. He has a remarkable talent for saying much in little space.

K. M.

---

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, General Index of Vols. LI-LX, 1936-1945, is now in press. It will run to about 140 pages, with the material arranged as in the General Index of Vols. I-L that appeared in 1935. Copies may be obtained from the Johns Hopkins Press.

---

ERRATA, Vols. LIII-LX. LIII, 556, last line, *for* W. P. *read* W. R.; LV, 487, running-title, *read* COPYHOLD; LVI, 583, title, *for* APOC-RYPHA *read* APOCALYPSE; LVII, 234, l. 8, *read* GORDAN; 450, paragraph 2, l. 2, *read* supradicto; 451, paragraph 3, l. 1, *read* salutis; LVIII, 82, l. 7 from bottom, *read* snugly; 210, l. 5, *read* Spectacles; 241, l. 19 *read* mopping; 424, l. 4 from bottom, *for* heap *read* keep; LX, 192, l. 10, *read* KELLEY.

# INDEX

## SUBJECTS

### Addison

A Note on the *Spectator* 459 274.

Ælfrie, see Bible.

### Aesthetics

The Enjoyment of the Arts 352;  
New Bearings in — and Art Criticism. A Study in Semantics and Evaluation 349.

### American Language

A New Meteorological Theory of Stress 497.

American Literature in 19th-Century England 69.

American Periodicals, see Balzac and James, Henry.

Anglo-Latin *buzones* 285.

Anglo-Saxon, Good 57.

### arabe

Stendhal, Joinville et un conte — 525.

*avant de* 401.

### Balzac

Notes sur deux noms propres de la *Comédie humaine* 50; Unnoticed Translations of — in American Periodicals 234.

### Barbara, Charles

Une Nouvelle française peu connue sur le machinisme menaçant 321.

Baudelaire: a Criticism 274.

*bederesc* 475.

Bellamy, E. 420.

### Berry, Mary and Agnes

Horace Walpole's Correspondence with — and Barbara Cecilia Seton 133.

### Bible

A Note on Ælfrie's Translation of Job I, 6 494; see *Psalmi*.

Blair's Sermons, Dr. Johnson and 268.

### Boston of Bury

Modern Textual Corruption in MS Cambridge Additional 3470 248

Boswell, Johnson and 343.

Boyle, The Life and Works of the Honourable Robert 192.

### Browning

Sources of Mill's Criticism of "Pauline" 338.

Burton, The Psychiatry of Robert 201.

### Butler, Samuel

'Hudibras' Butler Abroad 254.

*buzones* 285.

Carlyle: Prophet of To-Day 281.

### Catullus

A Catullian Echo in George Chapman's *The Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois* 29.

Cazotte, Jacques (1719-1792) 276.

Chamfort, *la Jeune Indienne*, comédie en un acte et en vers 426.

Chapman, see Catullus.

### Charlemagne and Roland

The Source MS. of — and the Auchinleck Bookshop 22.

### Chaucer

— and *Partonope of Blois* 486;

—'s "Castle in Spain" (*HF* 1117)

39; —'s "Glorious Legende" 377;

—'s Hopeless Love 431; —'s

Madame Eglantine 325; Four —

Saints 480; *The Franklin's Tale*,

Line 942 477; A Note on —'s

Mother 382; Some — Allusions by

Sir Edward Coke 483; Troilus and

Pilgrims in Wartime 47.

"chrestiens de la saincture" 206,

210, 211.

### Churchill, Charles

Possible Additions to the —

Canon 453.

Coke, see Chaucer.

Coleridge, see Keats.

Columbus, see Freneau.

### *couleur locale*

The First Use of — in French

Literary Criticism[?] 98.

Cristóbal de Mesa and Tasso's *Rime*

469.

### Criticism

Writers and Their Critics 196;

see *couleur locale* and English

Criticism.

**Dante**

An Inheritance of Magic? 324.

**Daude de Pradas**

The Romance of — Called *Dels Auzels Cassadors* 571.

**Desmaretz's Visionnaires, The Châteaude Richelieu and 167.****Diderot and Chief Logan's Speech (Frontières de Virginie) 176.****Donne, John**

— and Valeriano 358; —, His Flight from Medievalism 131; —'s "Paradise and Calvarie 398; Two Annotations on —'s Verse 54.

**Dowson, Ernest 424.****Du Bellay's Olive CXII and the Rime diverse 527.****English**

Anglo-French Etymologies 503; Good Anglo-Saxon 57; Notes on British Solomon Islands Pidgin 315; Not in the Dictionaries 495; Some Linguistic Studies of 1941-1944 535; A Suggestion as to the Origin of *sundae* 534.

**English Criticism**

Distinctions between Fancy and Imagination in 18th-Century — 8; English Literary Criticism: The Medieval Phase 65; The Theory of the Epic in England, 1650-1800 345.

**English Domestic or Homiletic Tragedy, 1575 to 1642 278.****English History**

Juridical Folklore in England 502; The *Manuel des Pêchés* and an English Episcopal Decree 439.

**English Literature**

The Crooked Rib 421; Essays and Studies by Members of the Department of English of the University of California 67; The Kelmscott Edition of the *Psalmi Penitentiales* and Morgan MS. 99 16; Leveller Manifestoes of the Puritan Revolution 135; Machiavelli's *The Prince*, An Elizabethan Translation 418; "Magnificat Nunc Dimittis" in *Misogonus* 45; The Source MS. of *Charlemagne and Roland* and the Auchinleck Bookshop 22; see English Criticism.

**English Poetry**

Endymion in England: the Literary History of a Greek Myth 423; A Romantic View of Poetry 427.

**Errata 574.**

*esverré* 319.

**Faire Maide of Bristow, The (1605), Another Bad Quarto 302.****Fatal Extravagance, The Authorship of The 328.****Foigny**

Bibliographical Observations on —, Lahontan and Tyssot de Patot 143.

**Ford, The Tragic Muse of John 411.****Foster, Emily, see Irving.****Foxe, see Rowley.****French**

Anglo — Etymologies 503; *avant de Plus* the Infinitive 401; "chrestiens de la sainture" 206, 210, 211; — *mièvre* 52; — Syntax List 354.

**French Learned Journals 283.****French Literary Criticism, see *couleur locale*.****French Poetry, see George.****Freneau and the Bones of Columbus 121.****Frisian**

Kening Finn 353; *De Pearel*: in Visioen ut it Middle-Ingelsk oerbrocht yn it Nij-Frysk 353.

**Gawain, Sir, and the Green Knight, *Lote, Lotez* in 492.****George**

Direct Echoes of French Poetry in Stefan —'s Works 461.

**Gérard de Nerval's *Octavie* 172.****German Drama**

The Passion Play of Lucerne 344. German Lexicography 157, 364.

**German Literature**

Magic and Natural Science in Baroque — 58; Vom Adel des Geistes. Gesammelte Reden 61.

***Geu des Trois Roys, La Nativité et Le* 277.****Gide, André**

The French of Klaus Mann's — 99.

**Goethe, see Seidlin.****Gothic Syntactical Notes 104.****Gottfried von Strassburg, *Tristan und Isolde* 63.****Greek**

Endymion in England 423.

**Guerra Junqueiro**

O Sôpro de Deus 472.

**Gumpenberg, Baron von, see Irving.****Hauptmann, Gerhart 429.**

## Hawthorne

—: Critic of Society 138; —'s Note to "Dr. Heidegger's Experiment" 408; — the Artist. Fine-Art Devices in Fiction 71; The Literary Source of —'s *Fanshawe* 1.

## Hazlitt

— and Malthus 215; — in the Workshop: The MS. of "The Fight" 136; A Quotation by — from Rousseau 57.

## Henryson

Cresseid's Leprosy Again 487; A Note on — and Lydgate 101.

## Herbert of Cherbury

Lord —'s *De Religione Laici* 201.

## Herluin

178.

Heusler, see *Nibelungenlied*.

## Hill, Aaron

The Authorship of *The Fatal Extravagance* 328.

## Hopkins, Gerard Manley, A Life 199.

## Horace, see Pope.

## Howard, Sir Robert, An Unpublished Letter of 119.

## Hrotsvitha Codex, On the Two Minor Poems in the 373.

## Irving, Washington

Baron von Gumpenberg, Emily Foster, and — 333.

## James, Henry

Criticism in American Periodicals of the Works of — from 1866-1916 341; The Major Phase 341; A Misprint in *The Awkward Age* 497.

## Johnson

Dr. — and Blair's Sermons 268; — and Boswell. Three Essays 343.

## Joinville, see Stendhal.

## Jonson, Ben

A Note on —'s *The Staple of News* 117; Shakespeare & — 414.

## Joyce, James

A Skeleton Key to *Finnegans Wake* 137.

## Keats

— and Coleridge: "La Belle Dame sans Merci" 270; — and the Victorians. A Study of His Influence and Rise to Fame, 1821-1895 350.

## Kleist, see Rilke.

Lachmann, see *Nibelungenlied*.

## Lahontan, see Foigny.

Lawman's *Gernemuße* 41.

Leveller Manifestoes of the Puritan Revolution 135.

## Logan, Chief, see Diderot.

Longfellow of Harvard, Professor 203.

## Lope de Vega

A Classical Theme in — and G. B. Marino 287.

## lote, lotez 492.

*Ludus Coventriae*

Some Notes on the "Prologue of Demon" of — 78.

## Lydgate, see Henryson.

Lyly's *Midas* 326.

## Lyndsay, Sir David

The Christening in *The Three Estates* 42.

Machiavelli's *The Prince*, an Elizabethan Translation 418.

*Malleus Maleficarum*, see Milton.

## Malthus, see Hazlitt.

## Mann, Klaus, see Gide.

*Manuel des Pêchés*, see William of Waddington.

## Marino, see Lope de Vega.

Markoe, Peter, (1752?-1792): a Philadelphia Writer 425.

## Marlowe, see Rowley.

Maupassant Borrows from Himself 530.

## Melville

Herman —. The Tragedy of Mind 339; —'s Religious Thought. An Essay in Interpretation 339; A Note on —'s Lecture in New Haven 55.

*mièvre* 52.

## Mill

Sources of —'s Criticism of "Pauline" 338.

## Milton

John —'s Complete Poetical Works 188; — and *Malleus Maleficarum* 118; — Quotes from Petrarch? 496; Spenser and —: an Early Analogue 394.

*Misogonus*

"Magnificat Nunc Dimittis" in — 45.

## Mitchell, Joseph

The Authorship of *The Fatal Extravagance* 328.

*Modern Language Notes*, General Index, 1936-1945 574.

*Monthly Repository*, The

The Dissidence of Dissent: —, 1806-1838 280.

- Nativité, La, et Le Jeu des Trois Roys** 277.
- Nibelungenlied**  
The Concept 'Sage' in Nibelungen Criticism. The History of the Conception from Lachmann to Heusler 569.
- Norway, The Voice of 574.
- Obituary:** B. J. Vos 430.
- Old English Literature  
Kening Finn 353.
- Old French  
— *esverré* 319; — *Herluin* 178;  
— *raqueer, recoier, recoi* 522.
- Owles Almanack, The** 206.
- Paine, Thomas:** Representative Selections 283.
- Partonope of Blois,** Chaucer and 486.
- Passion Play of Lucerne, The 344
- Pearl**  
*De Pearel:* in Visioen ut it Middle-Ingelsk oerbrecht yn it Nij-Frysk 353; Some Debatable Words in — and Its Theme 241.
- Persian Poetry, see Tennyson.
- Petrarch**  
Milton Quotes from —? 496; — and the Renaissance 356.
- Pidgin English, see English.
- Poe**  
An Incipient Libel Suit Involving — 308; The Sources of —'s "Eldorado" 312.
- Pope**  
Alexander —: A List of Critical Studies Published from 1895 to 1944 501; *The Dunciad* 501; Early Criticism of —'s "Night-Piece" 265; A MS. of —'s Imitation of the First Ode of the Fourth Book of Horace 185; The Twickenham Edition of the Poems of Alexander — 501.
- Provençal  
Old — *bederesc* 475.
- Psalmi Penitentiales**  
The Kilmiscott Edition of the — and Morgan MS. 99 16.
- Quarles, Francis, and Henry D. Thoreau** 335.
- Raimbaut d'Aurenga**  
Completion of a Text of — 404.
- Ralegh, An Epitaph Attributed to 111.
- raqueer, recoi, recoier* 522.
- Renaissance, see Petrarch.
- Richelieu, see Desmaretz.
- Rilke**  
Das Motiv des Fallens bei — 295; Rainer Maria —: Poems 197; —'s Fourth Duino Elegy and Kleist's Essay *Über das Marionettentheater* 73.
- Rime diverse*, see Du Bellay.
- Roland and Vernagu**  
The Auchinleck — and the *Short Chronicle* 94.
- Romance Philology  
G. Bonfante: "The Romance Desiderative *se*" 211.
- Rousseau, J.-J., see Hazlitt.
- Rowley, Foxe, and the *Faustus* Additions 391.
- Scaliger's Poetices libri septem,** The Preface to 447.
- Scandinavian for War and Peace 26, 356.
- Schiller**  
An Early — Letter 410.
- Seidlin  
Zu Oskar —'s "Das Etwas und das Nichts" 428.
- Seton, Barbara Cecilia, see Berry.
- Shakespeare  
Fallstaff and the Art of Dying 383; A French Pun in "Love's Labour's Lost" 124; "A Living Drollery" (*Tempest*, III, iii, 21) 387; Macbeth's *cyme* Once More 33; — & Jonson, Their Reputations in the Seventeenth Century Compared 414; — and the Actors. The Stage Business in His Plays (1660-1905) 127; —'s Comment on Mediaeval Romance in *Midsummer-Night's Dream* 85; —, Sonnet cxl. 12 357; Shakespearean Comedy and Other Studies 417; William —'s Small Latine and Lesse Greeke 125.
- Shelley, Mary W.  
The Letters of — 572; —, A Biography 66.
- Shelley, P. B.  
An Unpublished — Letter 330.
- Short Chronicle*, see *Roland*.
- Simms**  
A Comparison of —'s *Richard Hurd* with Its Sources 406.
- Smollett, Tobias, Traveler-Novelist 499.
- Smythies, Mrs. Gordon 359.
- Spectator* 459, A Note on the 274.



## Spenser

- Evidences of Revision in *The Faerie Queene* III i, ii 114; — and Milton: an Early Analogue 394; —'s Connections with Hampshire 180; *The Variorum* — 140.  
 Steele, Richard, Tracts and Pamphlets by 204.  
 Stendhal, Joinville et un conte arabe 525.  
 Strachey's, Lytton, Revisions in *Books and Characters* 226.  
 Stress, A New Meteorological Theory of 497.  
*sundae* 534.  
 Swift and Sir William Temple, a Conjecture 259.

## Tasso

- Cristóbal de Mesa and —'s *Rime* 469.  
 Temple, Sir William, see Swift.  
 Tennyson and Persian Poetry Once More 284.  
 Thoreau, see Quarles.  
 Traherne, Thomas 201.  
 Tyssot de Patot, see Foigny.

## Valeriano

- John Donne and — 353.

## Walpole, Horace

- The Yale Edition of —'s Correspondence, Vols. XI, XII 133.  
 White, Henry Kirke  
 Was — a Victim of the Review Press? 337.  
 William of Wadington  
 The *Manuel des Péchés* and an English Episcopal Decree 439.  
 Wise, Thomas J.  
 Letters of — to John Henry Wrenn 347.  
 Wordsworth  
 The Poetical Works of William — 195; —'s Tour of the Wye: 1798 291; —'s "Travelling Cripple" 272.  
 Wrenn, see Wise.  
 Wyatt as a Scottish Poet 106.

- Young, Edward, and the Wycombe Election 459.

## AUTHORS OF ARTICLES AND OF BOOKS REVIEWED

- Adams, H. H., English Domestic or Homiletic Tragedy, 1575 to 1642 278.  
 Albrecht, W. P., Hazlitt and Malthus 215.  
 Allen, D. C., John Donne's "Paradise and Calvarie" 398; A Note on Lyly's *Midas* 326; (ed.), *The Owles Almanacke* 206; Two Annotations on Donne's Verse 54.  
 Ames, A. C., Early Criticism of Pope's "Night-Piece" 265.  
 Atkins, J. W. H., English Literary Criticism: The Medieval Phase 65.  
 Austin, H. D., An Inheritance of Magic? 324; A Suggestion as to the Origin of *sundae* 534.  
 Baldensperger, F., Notes sur deux noms propres de la *Comédie humaine* 50; Une Nouvelle française peu connue sur le machinisme menaçant 321.  
 Baldwin, T. W., William Shakespeare's Small Latine and Lesse Greeke 125.  
 Bate, W. J., see Bullitt.

- Baum, P. F., Chaucer's "Glorious Legende" 377.  
 Beach, J. W., A Romantic View of Poetry 427.  
 Beall, C. B., Cristóbal de Mesa and Tasso's *Rime* 469.  
 Beard, C. A., see Wolfe, D. M.  
 Benkovitz, M. J., Some Notes on the "Prologue of Demon" of *Ludus Coventriae* 78.  
 Bennett, C. H., see Lewis, W. S.  
 Bennett, J. D., Baudelaire: a Criticism 274.  
 Bennett, J. W., The *Variorum* Spenser 140.  
 Bentley, G. E., Shakespeare & Jonson 414.  
 Bentley, N. E., 'Hudibras' Butler Abroad 254.  
 Berend, E., Gerhart Hauptmann 429.  
 Bergel, K., Rilke's Fourth Duino Elegy and Kleist's Essay *Über das Marionettentheater* 73.  
 Bethurum, D., Shakespeare's Comment on Mediaeval Romance in *Midsummer-Night's Dream* 85.

- Blanchard, R. (ed.), Tracts and Pamphlets by Richard Steele 204.  
 Blume, B., Das Motiv des Fallens bei Rilke 295.  
 Bohnenblust, G., Vom Adel des Geistes. Gesammelte Reden 61.  
 Bohning, E. E., The Concept 'Sage' in Nibelungen Criticism 569.  
 Bowers, F., Evidences of Revision in *The Faerie Queene* III. 1, ii 114.  
 Bradner, L., Spenser's Connections with Hampshire 180.  
 Braswell, W., Melville's Religious Thought. An Essay in Interpretation 339.  
 Bressie, R., Modern Textual Corruption in MS Cambridge Additional 3470 248.  
 Bronson, B. H., Johnson and Boswell 343.  
 Bühler, C. F., The Kelmescott Edition of the *Psalmi Penitentiales* and Morgan MS. 99 16.  
 Bullitt, J. and Bate, W. J., Distinctions between Fancy and Imagination in 18th-Century English Criticism 8.  
 Butt, J. (ed.), The Twickenham Edition of the Poems of Alexander Pope 501.  
 Campbell, J. and Robinson, H. M., A Skeleton Key to *Finnegans Wake* 137.  
 Carpenter, N. C., A Note on Chaucer's Mother 382.  
 Carrière, J. M., Unnoticed Translations of Balzac in American Periodicals 234.  
 Case, A. E., Swift and Sir William Temple, a Conjecture 259.  
 Chambers, F. M., Completion of a Text of Raïmbaut d'Aurenga 404; Old Provençal *bederesc* 475.  
 Chinard, G. (ed.), Chamfort, *La Jeune Indienne* 426.  
 Clark, D. L., An Unpublished Shelley Letter 330.  
 Clark, H. H. (ed.), Thomas Paine: Representative Selections 283.  
 Clark, W. D., A Quotation by Hazlitt from Rousseau 57.  
 Cline, R. H., Four Chaucer Saints 480.  
 Closs, A. (ed.), Gottfried von Strassburg, *Tristan und Isolte* 63.  
 Cohon, B. J., A Catullian Echo in George Chapman's *The Revenge of Bussy d'Ambois* 29.  
 Craig, H. (ed.), Machiavelli's *The Prince*, an Elizabethan Translation 418.  
 Crawford, C. E., Edward Young and Wycombe Election 459.  
 Czoniczer, E., Stendhal, Joinville et un conte arabe 525.  
 Davis, C. R., A Note on Ælfric's Translation of Job I, 6 494.  
 Davis, K., A Note on the *Spectator* 459-274.  
 Deen, F. H., A Comparison of Simms's *Richard Hurdis* with Its Sources 406.  
 Della Vida, G. L., Reply (to Savage) 210.  
 Diebels, Sister M. C., Peter Markoe (1752?-1792) 425.  
 Dunkin, P. S., The Authorship of *The Fatal Extravagance* 328.  
 Evans, Bergen, The Psychiatry of Robert Burton 201.  
 Evans, Blakemore, The Passion Play of Lucerne 344.  
 Feise, E., Zu Oskar Seidlins "Das Etwas und das Nichts" 428.  
 Fess, G. M., Maupassant Borrows from Himself 530.  
 Fletcher, H. F. (ed.), John Milton's Complete Poetical Works 188.  
 Foley R. N., Criticism in American Periodicals of the Works of Henry James from 1866-1916 341.  
 Ford, G. H., Keats and the Victorians 350.  
 French, W. H., *The Franklin's Tale*, Line 942 477.  
 Fucilla, J. G., A Classical Theme in Lope de Vega and G. B. Marino 287.  
 Galway, M., Chaucer's Hopeless Love 431.  
 Gibbens, V. E., Hawthorne's Note to "Dr. Heidegger's Experiment" 408.  
 Gilbert, A. H., Milton Quotes from Petrarch? 496.  
 Gohdes, C., American Literature in 19th-Century England 69.  
 Goldstein, J. S., The Literary Source of Hawthorne's *Panshawe* 1.  
 Gordon, G., Shakespearian Comedy and Other Studies 417.  
 Gravely, W. H., Jr., An Incipient Libel Suit Involving Poe 308.

- Hall, L. S., Hawthorne: Critic of Society 138.
- Hall, R. A., Jr., Notes on British Solomon Islands Pidgin 315.
- Hall, V., Jr., The Preface to Scaliger's *Poetices libri septem* 447.
- Haugen, E., Scandinavian for War and Peace 26; see 356.
- Havens, R. D., A Misprint in *The Awkward Age* 497.
- Heyl, B. C., New Bearings in Esthetics and Art Criticism 349.
- Hillmann, Sister M. V., Some Debatable Words in *Pearl* and Its Theme 241.
- Hillway, T., A Note on Melville's Lecture in New Haven 55.
- Hornstein, L. H., Some Chaucer Allusions by Sir Edward Coek 483.
- Hutcheson, H. R. (ed. and tr.), Lord Herbert of Cherbury's *De Religione Laici* 201.
- Johnson, C. L., Professor Longfellow of Harvard 203.
- Jones, F. L. (ed.), The Letters of Mary W. Shelley 572.
- Kahrl, G. M., Tobias Smollett, Traveler-Novelist 499.
- Kalma, D. (tr.), Kening Finn 353; (tr.) *De Pearel*: in Visioen ut it Middle-Ingelsk oerbrocht yn it Nij-Frysk 353.
- Kenyon, J. S., Shakespeare, Sonnet cxi. 12 357.
- Kirschbaum, L., *The Faire Maide of Bristow* (1605), Another Bad Quarto 302.
- Koht, H., and Skard, S., The Voice of Norway 574.
- Koller, K., Falstaff and the Art of Dying 383.
- Krappe, A. H., O Sôpro de Deus 472.
- Kuhl, E. P., Chaucer's Madame Eglantine 325.
- Kurrelmeyer, W., An Early Schiller Letter 410; German Lexicography, Parts ix, x 157, 364; Obituary: B. J. Vos 430.
- Lancaster, H. C., *avant de Plus* the Infinitive 401; The Château de Richelieu and Desmaretz's *Visionnaires* 167; French Learned Journals 283.
- Lea, F. A., Carlyle: Prophet of To-Day 281.
- Le Comte, E. S., Endymion in England 423.
- Leisy, E. E., Francis Quarles and Henry D. Thoreau 335.
- Lemont, J. (tr.), Rainer Maria Rilke: Poems 197.
- Levi Della Vida, see Della Vida.
- Lewis, W. S. and Wallace, A. D., with Bennett, C. H. and Martz, E. M. (eds.), The Yale Edition of Horace Walpole's Correspondence, Vols. xi, xii 133.
- Livingston, C. H., O. F. *esverré* 319; O. F. *Herluin* 178; O. F. *raqueer*, *recoier*, *recoi* 522.
- Longaker, M., Ernest Dowson 424.
- Loomis, L. H., The Auchinleck *Roland and Vernagu* and the *Short Chronicle* 94.
- Mabbott, T. O., John Donne and Valeriano 358; The Sources of Poe's "Eldorado" 312.
- Mack, M., A MS. of Pope's Imitation of the First Ode of the Fourth Book of Horace 185.
- McNulty, J. B., Wordsworth's Tour of the Wye: 1798 291.
- Malakis, E., The First Use of *couleur locale* in French Literary Criticism[?] 98.
- Malone, K., Good Anglo-Saxon 57; Some Linguistic Studies of 1941-1944 535.
- Marsh, P., Freneau and the Bones of Columbus 121.
- Martz, E. M., see Lewis, W. S.
- Matthiessen, F. O., Henry James, The Major Phase 341.
- Merrill, R. V., Du Bellay's *Olive* cxii and the *Rime diverse* 527.
- Miller, E. S., The Christening in *The Three Estates* 42; "Magnificat Nunc Dimittis" in *Misogonus* 45.
- Mineka, F. E., The Dissidence of Dissent: *The Monthly Repository*, 1806-1838 280.
- Mohr, G. J., The Psychiatry of Robert Burton 201.
- Moloney, M. F., John Donne, His Flight from Medievalism 131.
- More, L. T., The Life and Works of the Honourable Robert Boyle 192.
- Morgan, A. E., Edward Bellamy 420.
- Oliver, L. M., Rowley, Foxe, and the *Faustus* Additions 391.
- Paden, W. D., Tennyson and Persian Poetry Once More 284.
- Parr, J., Chaucer and *Partonope of Blois* 486; Cresseid's Leprosy

- Again 487; A Note on Jonson's *The Staple of News* 117.
- Pei, M. A., Scandinavian for War and Peace 356; see 26.
- Peyre, H., Writers and Their Critics 196.
- Poston, L., Jr., French Syntax List 354.
- Prescott, J., Not in the Dictionaries 495.
- Pyles, T., A New Meteorological Theory of Stress 497.
- Ratchford, F. E.** (ed.), Letters of Thomas J. Wise to John Henry Wrenn 347.
- Reichart, W. A., Baron von Gumpenberg, Emily Foster, and Washington Irving 333.
- Rhodes, S. A., Note on Gérard de Nerval's *Octavie* 172.
- Robertson, D. W., The *Manuel des Pêchés* and an English Episcopal Decree 439.
- Robinson, H. M., see Campbell, J.
- Ruggles, E., Gerard Manley Hopkins, a Life 199.
- Salvan, A. J.**, The French of Klaus Mann's *André Gide* 99.
- Sanders, C. R., Lytton Strachey's Revisions in *Books and Characters* 226.
- Savage, H. L., "Chrestiens de la sainture," A friendly rejoinder 206, 211; *Lote, lotz* in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* 492.
- Schmitz, R. M., Dr. Johnson and Blair's Sermons 268.
- Schoen, M. (ed.), The Enjoyment of the Arts 352.
- Schubert, L., Hawthorne the Artist 71.
- Schutz, A. H. (ed.), The Romance of Daude de Pradas Called *Dels Auzels Cassadors* 571.
- Sedgwick, W. E., Herman Melville. The Tragedy of Mind 339.
- Seeber, E. D., Diderot and Chief Logan's Speech (*Frontiers de Virginie*) 176.
- Selincourt, E. de (ed.), The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth 195.
- Sensabaugh, G. F., An Answer to Suckling's "Why so pale and wan, fond lover?" 410; The Tragic Muse of John Ford 411.
- Shaaber, M. A., "A Living Drolery" (*Tempest*, III, iii, 21) 387.
- Shaw, E. P., Jacques Cazotte (1719-1792) 276.
- Siler, H. D., A French Pun in "Love's Labour's Lost" 124.
- Singleton, C. S., Reply (to Whitfield) 356.
- Skard, see Koht.
- Smith, R. M., Chaucer's "Castle in Spain" (*HF* 1117) 39; Lawman's *Gernemuße* 41; Macbeth's *cyme* Once More 33; Spenser and Milton: an Early Analogue 394.
- Spargo, J. W., Juridical Folklore in England 502.
- Spitzer, L., Anglo-French Etymologies 503; Anglo-Latin *buzones* 285; Fr. *mièvre* 52; G. Bonfante, "The Romance Desiderative *se*" 211.
- Sprague, A. C., Shakespeare and the Actors 127.
- Stearns, M. W., A Note on Henryson and Lydgate 101.
- Storer, M. E., Bibliographical Observations on Foigny, Lahontan and Tyssot de Patot 143.
- Strathmann, E. A., An Epitaph Attributed to Raleigh 111.
- Sturtevant, A. M., Gothic Syntactical Notes 104.
- Summers, M., Mrs. Gordon Smythies 359.
- Sutherland, J. (ed.), *The Dunciad* 501.
- Svensen, K., Milton and *Malleus Maleficarum* 118.
- Swedenberg, H. T., Jr., The Theory of the Epic in England, 1650-1800 345.
- Thayer, M. R.**, Keats and Coleridge: "La Belle Dame sans Merci" 270.
- Tobin, J. E., Alexander Pope: A List of Critical Studies Published from 1895 to 1944 501.
- Utley, F. L.**, The Crooked Rib 421; Wyatt as a Scottish Poet 106.
- Vordtriede, W.**, Direct Echoes of French Poetry in Stefan George's Works 461.
- Wade, G. I.**, Thomas Traherne 201.
- Wagman, F. H., Magic and Natural Science in German Baroque Literature 58.
- Wallace, A. D., see Lewis, W. S.
- Walpole, R. N., The Source MS. of

- Charlemagne and Roland* and the Auchinleck Bookshop 22.  
 Ward, C. E., An Unpublished Letter of Sir Robert Howard 119.  
 Ward, W. S., Was Henry Kirke White a Victim of the Review Press? 337.  
 Weatherly, E. H., Possible Additions to the Churchill Canon 453.  
 Wenger, C. N., Sources of Mill's Criticism of "Pauline" 338.  
 Whitfield, J. H., Petrarch and the Renaissance 356.  
 Whiting, B. J., Troilus and Pilgrims in Wartime 47.  
 Whittredge, R. (ed.), *La Nativité et Le Jeu des Trois Roys* 277.  
 Wilcox, S. C., Hazlitt in the Workshop: The MS. of "The Fight" 136.  
 Wiley, A. N., Wordsworth's "Traveling Cripple" 272.  
 Wolfe, D. M. (ed.), *Leveller Manifestoes of the Puritan Revolution* (Foreword by C. A. Beard) 135.  
 Zeydel, E. H., On the Two Minor Poems of the Hrotsvitha Codex 373.

REVIEWERS

- Abrams, M. H.: J. W. Beach, A Romantic View of Poetry 427.  
 Allen, D. C.: B. Evans, The Psychiatry of Robert Burton 201; H. R. Hutcheson (ed. and tr.), Lord Herbert of Cherbury's *De Religione Laici* 201; G. I. Wade, Thomas Traherne 201.  
 Berend, E.: G. Bohnenblust, Vom Adel des Geistes 61.  
 Braddy, H.: F. L. Utley, The Crooked Rib 421.  
 Bredvold, L. I.: J. Butt (ed.), The Twickenham Edition of the Poems of Alexander Pope 501; James Sutherland (ed.), *The Dunciad* 501; J. E. Tobin, Alexander Pope: A List of Critical Studies Published from 1895 to 1944 501.  
 Brooke, T.: T. W. Baldwin, William Shakespeare's Small Latine and Lesse Greeke 125.  
 Campbell, O. J.: G. F. Sensabaugh, The Tragic Muse of John Ford 411.  
 Chambers, F. M.: A. H. Schutz (ed.), The Romance of Daude de Pradas called *Dels Auzels Cassadors* 571.  
 Chase, S. P.: S. C. Wilcox (ed.), Hazlitt in the Workshop: The MS. of "The Fight" 136.  
 Cuyler, C. M.: G. H. Ford, Keats and the Victorians 350.  
 Edelstein, L.: F. H. Wagman, Magic and Natural Science in German Baroque Literature 58.  
 Farnham, W.: H. H. Adams, English Domestic or Homiletic Tragedy, 1575 to 1642 278.  
 Feise, E.: J. Lemont (tr.), Rainer Maria Rilke: Poems 197.  
 Gerould, G. H.: J. W. H. Atkins, English Literary Criticism: The Medieval Phase 65.  
 Gilbert, A. H.: H. Craig (ed.), Machiavelli's *The Prince*, an Elizabethan Translation 418.  
 Gilbert, K.: M. Schoen (ed.), The Enjoyment of the Arts 352.  
 Gilman, M.: J. D. Bennett, *Baudelaire: a Criticism* 274.  
 Grabo, C.: F. L. Jones (ed.), The Letters of Mary W. Shelley 572.  
 Granville-Barker, H.: A. C. Sprague, Shakespeare and the Actors 127.  
 Greene, R. L.: B. H. Bronson, Johnson and Boswell 343.  
 Haller, W.: D. M. Wolfe (ed.), *Leveller Manifestoes of the Puritan Revolution* 135.  
 Harbage, A.: G. E. Bentley, Shakespeare & Jonson 414.  
 Harrold, C. F.: F. A. Lea, Carlyle: Prophet of To-day 281.  
 Havens, G. R.: E. P. Shaw, Jacques Cazotte (1719-1792) 276.  
 Havens, R. D.: E. de Selincourt (ed.), The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth 195.  
 Hillway, T.: W. Braswell, Melville's Religious Thought 339; W. E. Sedgwick, Herman Melville 339.  
 Jones, H. M.: H. H. Clark (ed.), Thomas Paine: Representative Selections 283.

- Kelley, M.:** H. F. Fletcher (ed.), John Milton's Complete Poetical Works 188.
- Kirschbaum, L.:** E. Ruggles, Gerard Manley Hopkins, a Life 199.
- Lancaster, H. C.:** G. Chinard (ed.), *La Jeune Indienne*, par Chamfort 426.
- Levy, R.:** R. Whittredge (ed.), *La Nativité et Le Jeu des Trois Roys* 277.
- McKillop, A. D.:** R. Blanchard (ed.), Tracts and Pamphlets by Richard Steele 204.
- Magoun, F. P., Jr.:** D. Kalma (tr.), Kening Finn; *De Pearel*: in Vision ut it Middle-Ingelsk oerbrought yn it Nij-Frisk 353.
- Malone, K.:** H. Koht and S. Skard, The Voice of Norway 574; J. W. Spargo, Juridical Folklore in England 502.
- Martz, L. L.:** G. M. Kahrl, Tobias Smollett, Traveler-Novelist 499.
- Miner, L. M.:** M. C. Diebels, Peter Markoe (1752?-1792) 425.
- Mizener, A.:** M. Longaker, Ernest Dowson 424.
- Prescott, J.:** Joseph Campbell and H. M. Robinson, A Skeleton Key to *Finnegans Wake* 137.
- Richards, I. A.:** B. C. Heyl, New Bearings in Esthetics and Art Criticism 349.
- Root, R. K.:** W. S. Lewis (ed.), The Yale Edition of Horace Walpole's Correspondence, Vols. XI, XII 133.
- Sehrt, E. H.:** B. Evans, The Passion Play of Lucerne 344.
- Selmer, C.:** E. E. Bohning, The Concept 'Sage' in Nibelungen Criticism 569; A. Closs (ed.), Gottfried von Strassburg, Tristan und Isolde 63.
- Shaaber, M. A.:** G. Gordon, Shakespearean Comedy and Other Studies 417.
- Shafer, R.:** Members of the Department of English, Univ. of Calif., Essays and Studies 67; H. T. Swedenberg, Jr., The Theory of the Epic in England, 1650-1800 345.
- Smith, H. N.:** C. Gohdes, American Literature in 19th-Century England 69.
- Spencer, T.:** M. F. Moloney, John Donne, His Flight from Medievalism 131.
- Spiller, R. E.:** R. N. Foley, Criticism in American Periodicals of the Works of Henry James from 1866-1916 341; F. O. Matthiessen, Henry James 341.
- Starnes, D. T.:** E. S. Le Comte, Endymion in England 423.
- Stewart, R.:** L. S. Hall, Hawthorne: Critic of Society 138.
- Taylor, G. C.:** D. C. Allen (ed.), *The Owles Almanacke* 206.
- Taylor, W. F.:** A. E. Morgan, Edward Bellamy 420.
- Thompson, L.:** C. L. Johnson, Professor Longfellow of Harvard 203.
- Thrall, M. M. H.:** F. E. Mineka, The Dissidence of Dissent: *The Monthly Repository*, 1806-1838 280.
- Weber, C. J.:** F. E. Ratchford (ed.), Letters of Thomas J. Wise to John Henry Wrenn 347.
- Wellek, R.:** H. Peyre, Writers and Their Critics 196.
- Williams, S. T.:** L. Schubert, Hawthorne the Artist. Fine-Art Devices in Fiction 71.
- Witherspoon, A. M.:** L. T. More, The Life and Works of the Honourable Robert Boyle 192.



## RECENT PUBLICATIONS

## ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received.]

Cazamian, Louis.—L'humour de Shakespeare. *Paris*: Aubier, 1945. Pp. 233. [Editions Montaigne.]

Frey, Ellen Frances.—Catalogue of the Whitman collection in the Duke university library, being a part of the Trent collection. *Durham*: Duke U. Library, 1945. Pp. xviii + 148.

Johnston, George Burke.—Ben Jonson: poet. *New York*: Columbia U. Press, 1945. Pp. x + 175. \$2.00.

Shipley, Joseph T.—Dictionary of word origins. *New York*: The Philosophical Library, 1945. Pp. xii + 430. \$5.00.

## GERMAN

Angelloz, J.-F.—La Littérature allemande. *Paris*: Presses Universitaires, 1943. 127 pp. Fr. 18.

Charpentier, John.—Goethe. *Paris*: Talandier, 1943. 316 pp. Fr. 30.

Evans, M. Blakemore. Festschrift für —. [Graduate School Studies, Language and Literature Series, No. 1]. *Columbus, O.*: Ohio State Univ. Press, 1945. 207 pp.

Lohan, Robert.—The Golden Age of German Literature. [Living German Literature, Vol. II]. *New York*: Frederick Ungar [1945]. 227 pp. \$2.75.

Loiseau, H.—Goethe. L'homme, l'écrivain, le penseur. *Paris*: Aubier, 1943. 442 pp. Fr. 110.

## FRENCH

Aegerte, E. et P. Labracherie.—Guillaume Apollinaire. *Paris*: Sequana, 1943. 268 pp. Fr. 48.

Alain-Fournier. — Lettres à sa famille (1905-14). Avant-propos d'Isabelle Rivière. *Paris*: Emile-Paul, 1940. 344 pp.

Arland, Marcel.—Le paysan fr. à travers la littérature. Textes choisis. *Paris*: Stock, 1941. 189 pp. Fr. 20.

Arrault, Albert.—La Touraine de Balzac. *Tours*: Arrault, 1943. 224 pp.

Audrin, E., J. Orieux et R. Gillet.—Notre belle langue: le Français. *Paris*: Charles-Lavauzelle, 1944. 412 pp. Fr. 40.

Augustin-Thierry, A.—Le Tragédien de Napoléon: Fr.-J. Talma. *Paris*: Albin-Michel, 1942. 326 pp. Fr. 36.

Bady, René.—Introd. à l'étude de la litt.

fr. *Fribourg*: Libr. de l'Univ., 1943. 154 pp. Fr. 45.

Bailly, A.—Beaumarchais. *Paris*: Fayard, 1945. Fr. 90.

Balzac.—Traité de la prière, éd. P. Bertault. *Paris*: Boivin, 1942. 128 pp.

Baudoin, Charles.—Psychanalyse de V. Hugo. *Geneva*: Eds. du Mont-Blanc, 1943. 264 pp. Fr. 120.

Beausire, Pierre.—Essai sur la poésie et la poétique de Mallarmé. *Lausanne*: Roth, 1942. 220 pp. Fr. 80.

Bertault, Philippe.—Balzac et la religion. *Paris*: Boivin, 1942. 561 pp.

Bertelé, René.—Panorama de la jeune poésie fr. *Marseilles*: Laffont, 1942. 344 pp. Fr. 54.

Billy, André.—Vie de Balzac. 2 v. *Paris*: Flammarion, 1944. Fr. 130.

Boppe, Roger.—Stendhal à Rome. *Paris*: Horizons de France, 1944. 123 pp. Fr. 125.

Borel, Pierre.—Lettres de Guy de Maupassant à G. Flaubert. *Avignon*: Aubanel, 1941. 111 pp.

Borel, P.—Maupassant et l'Androgyne. *Paris*: Livre moderne, 1944. Fr. 50.

Bornecque.—Petite histoire de la litt. fr. 2 v. *Paris*: I. A. C., 1944. Fr. 15.

Brandt, Gustaf.—La concurrence entre soi et lui, eux, elle(s). *Lund*: Gleerup, 1944. 346 pp. Fr. 190.

Brunot, Ferdinand.—Hist. de la langue fr. T. X. La langue classique dans la tourmente. 2<sup>e</sup> partie. *Paris*: Colin, 1943. Fr. 180.

Bruyelle, R.—Les personnages de la tragédie classique. *Paris*: Debresse, 1944. Fr. 20.

Campbell, R.—L'œuvre litt. de Jean-Paul Sartre. *Paris*: Ardent, 1945.

Castelnau, J.—Lamartine. *Paris*: Talandier, 1944. Fr. 40.

Chanson de Roland, éd. Raoul Mortier. *Paris*: Maloine, 1944. 225 pp. Fr. 185.

Chanson, P.—Le droit à l'amour selon George Sand. *Paris*: A. Michel, 1944. 256 pp. Fr. 30.

Chapuisat, Edouard.—Salons et chanceleries au XVIII<sup>e</sup> s. *Lausanne*: Payot, 1943. 231 pp. Fr. 90.

Clavière, M.—Daudet ou le contrecourant d'une décadence. *Paris*: Office fr. du Livre, 1944. Fr. 30.

Colling, Alfred.—Gustave Flaubert. *Paris*: Fayard, 1942. 380 pp. Fr. 26.

Corneille.—Théâtre complet, éd. Maurice Rat. 3 v. *Paris*: Garnier, 1942. Fr. 128.

Courville, Xavier de.—Un apôtre de l'art au XVIII<sup>e</sup> s., Luigi Riccoboni dit Lelio. *Paris*: Droz, 1943. 65 pp.

— Luigi Riccoboni dit Lelio. *Ibid.*, 1943. 356 pp.

**Damourette et Pichon.**—Essai de grammaire de la langue fr. T. VI. *Paris*: d'Arthey, 1942. 743 pp. Fr. 250.

**Daudet, L.**—Lettres familiales d'Alphonse Daudet. *Paris*: Plon, 1944. 256 pp. Fr. 39.

**Dauzat, Albert.**—Les étapes de la langue fr. *Paris*: Presses univ., 1944. 134 pp. Fr. 18.

— Le génie de la langue fr. *Paris*: Payot, 1943. 365 pp.

**Delacour, André.**—Corneille et notre France. *Paris*: Floury, 1944. 138 pp. Fr. 54.

**Desonay, Fernand.**—Le Grand Meaulnes d'Alain Fournier. *Brussels*: Ed. des Artistes, 1941. 252 pp.

**Dobelmann, Suzanne.**—La langue de Cahors des origines à la fin du XVI<sup>e</sup> s. *Toulouse*: Prioult, 1944. 229 pp. Fr. 150.

**Dorval, Marie.**—Lettres à Alfred de Vigny, éd. Charles Gaudier. *Paris*: N. R. F., 1942. 210 pp. Fr. 60.

**Dumesnil, René.**—Boileau. *Paris*: Belles Lettres, 1943. 61 pp. Fr. 100.

**Dumont, Francis.**—Naissance du romantisme contemporain. *Paris*: Eds. C.-L., 1942. 176 pp.

**Duraffour, Antonin.**—Lexique patois-fr. du parler de Vaux-en-Bugey (Ain). *Grenoble*: 1941. 388 pp. Fr. 400.

**Dyggve, H. P.**—Trouvères et protecteurs de trouvères dans les cours seigneuriales de France. *Helsinki*: 1942. 217 pp. Fr. 50.

**Engerand, Roland.**—Les amours d'Alfred de Vigny. *Tours*: Arrault, 1943. 188 pp.

**Fabre, Augustin.**—Du Nouveau sur la Chanson de Sainte-Foy. La Chanson de Roland dans la Chanson de Sainte-Foy. Aux sources de la Chanson de S.-F. La Chanson de S.-F. de Conques, poème Occitan du XII<sup>e</sup> s. 4 v. *Rodez*: Eds. de la Rev. Hist. du Rouergue, 1940-1. Fr. 400.

**Fahlin, Carin.**—Etude sur l'emploi des prépositions *en, à, dans* au sens local. *Uppsala*: Almqvist, 1942. 369 pp.

**Felvre, L.**—Autour de l'Heptaméron. *Paris*: N. R. F., 1944. Fr. 140.

**Fernandez, Ramon.**—Balzac. *Paris*: Stock, 1943. 236 pp.

— *Barres*. *Paris*: Livre moderne, 1943. 244 pp.

**Festugière, Jean.**—La philosophie de l'amour de Marsile Ficin et son influence sur la litt. fr. au XV<sup>e</sup> s. *Paris*: Vrin, 1941. 168 pp. Fr. 50.

**Flaubert.**—*Madame Bovary*, éd. R. Dumesnil. 2 v. *Paris*: Belles Lettres, 1944. Fr. 175.

**Floovant**, chanson de geste du XII<sup>e</sup> s., éd. Sven Andolf. *Uppsala*: 1941. clxxxiv + 201 pp. Fr. 130.

**Fourcassie, Jean.**—Le romantisme et les Pyrénées. *Paris*: N. R. F., 1940. 440 pp. Fr. 65.

**Fournet, Charles.**—Lamartine-roi. *Neuchâtel*: Eds. de la Baconnière, 1943. 222 pp. Fr. 70.

**Fuchs, Max.**—Lexique des troupes de comédiens au XVIII<sup>e</sup> s. *Paris*: Droz, 1944. 231 pp. Fr. 150.

**Gouhier, H.**—L'essence du théâtre. *Paris*: Plon, 1943. 256 pp.

**Guérin, Eugénie de.**—Lettres à sa famille et à divers, éd. Mgr. Emile Barthès. *Paris*: Didier, 1942. 424 pp. Fr. 80.

**Haust, Jean.**—Dix pièces de vers sur les femmes et le mariage. *Liège*: Vaillant-Carmanne, 1941. 103 pp. Fr. 38.

— (éd.)—Médicinaire liègeois du XIII<sup>e</sup> s. et médicinaire namurois du XV<sup>e</sup>. *Brussels*: Vaillant-Carmanne, 1941. 215 pp. Fr. 80.

**Hauteceur, Louis.**—Littérature et peinture en France du XVII<sup>e</sup> s. *Paris*: Colin, 1942. 320 pp.

**Hazard, Paul.**—Les origines intellectuelles de l'Europe contemporaine. Le 18<sup>e</sup> s. de Montesquieu à Lessing, 1715-60. *Paris*: Boivin, sous presse, environ (1944) 600 pp.

**Henriot, E.**—De Turol à A. Chénier. *Paris*: Lardanchet, 1944. Fr. 65.

**Hoog, A.**—Littérature en Silésie: Racine, Chateaubriand, Stendhal, Baudelaire, Apollinaire. *Paris*: Grasset, 1944. Fr. 45.

**Hoybye, Poul.**—L'accord en fr. contemp. *Copenhagen*: Host, 1944. 328 pp. Fr. 200.

**Jacoubet, Henri.**—Stendhal. *Paris*: N. R. Crit., 1943. 221 pp. Fr. 75.

**Jean-Aubry, G.**—Une amitié exemplaire. Villiers de l'Isle-Adam et S. Mallarmé d'après des docs. inédits. *Paris*: Mercure de France, 1942. 120 pp. Fr. 21.

**Kerchove, A. de.**—Benjamin Constant ou le libertin sentimental. *Brussels*: Renaissance du Livre, 1943. 416 pp. Fr. 80.

**Konrad, Hedwig.**—Etude sur la métaphore. *Paris*: Vrin, 1939. 165 pp. Fr. 30.

**Labande, E.-R.**—Etude sur *Baudouin de Sebourg* Chanson de geste. *Paris*: Droz, 1940. 211 pp. Fr. 80.

**Lachèvre, F.**—Un émule de Coquillart: Roger de Collerye. *Paris*: Margraff, 1942. 109 pp. Fr. 45.

**Laclos.**—Les liaisons dangereuses, éd. E. Maynial. 2 v. *Paris*: Belles Lettres, 1943. Fr. 145.

— Œuvres complètes, éd. M. Allem. *Paris*: N. R. F. 941 pp. Fr. 100.

**La Fayette, Mme de.**—Correspondance, éd. A. Beaunier. *Paris*: N. R. F., 1942. Fr. 175.

**La Fuye, M. de et E. Guéret.**—Rouget de

Lisle inconnu. *Paris*: Hachette, 1943. 286 pp. Fr. 45.

Lamartine. — Correspondance générale, publ. sous la direction de M. Levailant. *Paris*: Droz, 1943. 410 pp. Fr. 160.

La Sale, Antoine de. — Œuvres complètes. T. II. Ed. crit. par F. Desonay. *Paris*: Droz, 1941. 283 pp. Fr. 106.

Lebègue, Raymond. — Les correspondants de Peiresc dans les anciens Pays-Bas. *Brussels*: Office de Publicité, 1943. 80 pp. Fr. 30.

— La tragédie fr. de la Renaissance. *Ibid.*, 1944. 92 pp. Fr. 30.

Lecat, Maurice. — Les Caractères principaux du génie de Maurice Maeterlinck. *Brussels*: Castaigne, 1938. 93 pp.

— Maurice Maeterlinck en pantoufles. *Ibid.*, 1939. 80 pp.

Lejeune, R. — Histoire sommaire de la litt. wallonne. *Brussels*: Off. de Publicité, 1942. 116 pp. Fr. 40.

Lenôtre, G. — Existences d'artistes. De Molière à V. Hugo. *Paris*: Grasset, 1941. 336 pp. Fr. 31.20.

Leonard, Albert. — Alain-Fournier et le Grand Meaulnes. *Paris*: Desclée de Brouwer, 1944. 296 pp. Fr. 66.

Lequenne, F. — La Vie d'Olivier de Serres. *Paris*: Sequana, 1942. 397 pp. Fr. 100.

Levailant, M. — Lamartine et l'Italie en 1820. *Paris*: Flammarion, 1944. 320 pp. Fr. 48.

Lupé, M. de. — Mérimée. *Paris*: A. Michel, 1945. 248 pp. Fr. 112.

Magny, Cl.-Ed. — Précieux Giraudoux. Une métaphysique de la préciosité. *Paris*: Ed. du Seuil, 1944. 128 pp. Fr. 50.

Malmberg, Bertil. — Le système consonantique du fr. moderne. *Lund*: Gleerup, 1943. 73 pp. Fr. 65.

Marguerite de Navarre. — L'Heptaméron, éd. Michel François. *Paris*: Garnier, 1943. 516 pp. Fr. 40.

Marouzeau. — Précis de stylistique française. *Paris*: Masson, 1940. 173 pp.

Martin-Chauffier. — Chateaubriand ou l'obsession de la pureté. *Paris*: N. R. F., 1944. Fr. 70.

Martino, P. — L'époque romantique en France. *Paris*: Boivin, 1944. Fr. 48.

Massin, Jean. — Baudelaire devant la douleur. *Paris*: Sequana, 1944. 186 pp. Fr. 45.

Mauriac, Cl. — Jean Cocteau ou la vérité du mensonge. *Paris*: Lieutier, 1945. Fr. 60.

Maurras, Ch. — Poésie et vérité. Racine, Rousseau, etc. *Paris*: Lardanchet, 1944. Fr. 49.

Mazel, Henri. — Aux beaux temps du

symbolisme (1890-5). *Paris*: Mercure de France, 1943. 195 pp. Fr. 24.

Mélanges de philologie offerts à M. Joan Melander. *Uppsala*: Lundequist, 1943. Fr. 200.

Molière. — Mariage forcé, Princesse d'Elide, Don Juan, l'Amour méd., éd. R. Bray. *Paris*: Belles Lettres, 1943. 317 pp. Fr. 55.

Mondor, H. — Mallarmé plus intime. *Paris*: N. R. F., 1944. Fr. 56.

Monnerot, J. — La poésie moderne et le sacré. *Paris*: N. R. F., 1944. Fr. 100.

Morrow, Christine. — Le roman irréaliste dans les litts. contemp. de langues fr. et anglaise. *Paris*: Didier, 1941. 332 pp. Fr. 80.

Muller-Hauser, M.-L. — La mise en relief d'une idée en fr. mod. *Geneva*: Droz, 1943. 291 pp. Fr. 225.

Musset. — Nouvelles et contes. III. Ed. R. Doré. *Paris*: Conard, 1940. Fr. 50.

Nadeau, M. — Histoire du Surréalisme. *Paris*: Ed. du Seuil, 1945. 376 pp. Fr. 180.

Nissen, Harald. — L'ordre des mots dans la chronique de Jean d'Outremeuse. *Uppsala*: Almqvist, 1943. 141 pp.

Nystrom, U. (ed.). — Poèmes français sur les biens d'un ménage. *Helsinki*: 1940. 389 pp.

Pascal. — Pensées, éd. Z. Tournet. *Paris*: Vrin, 1942. 366 pp. Fr. 100.

Pauphilet, Albert. — Jeux et sagesse du moyen âge. *Paris*: N. R. F., 1941. 925 pp. Fr. 160.

Pessonneux, R. et C. Gautier. — Quelle est l'origine, la formation, la signification des mots français? *Paris*: Nathan, 1941. 370 pp. Fr. 31.50.

Pichon, Edouard. — L'enrichissement lexical dans le français d'aujourd'hui. *Paris*: d'Artrey, 1942. 77 pp. Fr. 25.

Polain, Eugène. — Contes populaires entendus en fr. à Liège. *Paris*: Droz, 1942. 368 pp. Fr. 100.

Poulaille, Henry. — La fleur des chansons d'amour du XVI<sup>e</sup> s. *Paris*: Grasset, 1943. 430 pp. Fr. 120.

Prévost, Jean. — La création chez Stendhal. *Marseille*: Eds. du Sagittaire, 1943. 256 pp.

Ramuz, C.-F. — Anthologie de la poésie fr. 2 v. *Paris*: Corrèa, 1943.

Rat, Maurice. — Florilège de poésie contemporaine. *Paris*: Garnier, 1943. 240 pp. Fr. 60.

Robert-Busquet, L. — Farces du moyen âge. *Paris*: Lanore, 1942. 141 pp.

Rolland, R. — Péguy. 2 v. *Paris*: A. Michel, 1944. 360 + 336 pp. Fr. 1200.

Saint-René Tallandier, Mme. — Racine. *Paris*: Grasset, 1940. 343 pp. Fr. 45.

Saulnier, V. L.—*La litt. du Moyen-Age*. Paris: Presses Univ., 1944. 136 pp. Fr. 15.

Schmidt, A.-M.—*La littérature symboliste*. Paris: Presses Univ., 1944. 126 pp. Fr. 18.

Segond, J.—*La signification de la tragédie*. Paris: Belles Lettres, 1943. 15 pp. Fr. 60.

Seillière, Ernest.—Diderot. Paris: Eds. de France, 1944. 299 pp. Fr. 50.

Sharon d'Obremmer, M.-A.—*Les rôles de femmes dans la comédie fr. de Molière à Marivaux*. Paris: Le François, 1941. 300 pp. Fr. 80.

Teissier, M.—*La chanson de Roland*. Paris: Lanore, 1944. 122 pp. Fr. 30.

Thiry, Paul.—*Le théâtre fr. au moyen âge*. Brussels: Office de Publicité, 1942. 109 pp. Fr. 30.

Tourneur, Z.—*Une vie avec Blaise Pascal*. Paris: Vrin, 1944. 164 pp. Fr. 60.

Trahard, Pierre.—*L'art de Colette*. Paris: Jean-Renard, 1941. 53 pp. Fr. 10.

Truc, G.—Paul Claudel. Paris: N. R. Crit., 1945. Fr. 54.

Valéry, Paul.—*Les pages immortelles de Descartes*. Paris: Corrèa, 1941. 240 pp. Fr. 24.

Van Tieghem, P.—Musset. *L'homme et l'œuvre*. Paris: Boivin, 1944. Fr. 50.

— *Le Romantisme français*. Paris: Presses univ., 1944. 126 pp. Fr. 18.

Weerenbeck, B. H. J.—*Le pronom on en fr. et en provençal*. Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij, 1943. 108 pp. Fr. 162.

Yedlicka, Brother Leo Charles.—*Expressions of the Linguistic Area of Repentance and Remorse in Old French*. Diss. Washington, D. C.: Catholic U., 1945. xx + 439 pp. (Studies in Romance Langs., 27.)

### SPANISH

Alonso de Molina.—*Vocabulario en Lengua Castellana y Mexicana*, obra impresa en México en 1571 y ahora editada en facsimil. Madrid: Eds. Cultura Hispánica, 1944. iii + 290 hoj.

Andrade, O. V.—*Obras poéticas*, ed. Tiscornia. Buenos Aires: Acad. de Letras, 1943. 242 pp.

Anzoátegui, I. B.—*Tres Ensayos españoles* (Mendoza, Góngora, Calixto). Prólogo de Juan Carlos Goyeneche. Madrid: Eds. Haz, 1944. 124 pp.

Barbará, Federico.—*Manual o vocabulario de la lengua pampa*. Buenos Aires: Emecé, 1944. 174 pp.

Castro Guisasola, F.—*El Enigma del Vascuence ante las Lenguas Indoeuropeas*. Madrid: Inst. Nebrija, 1944. 289 pp. (RFE, XXX.)

Castro Leal, A.—*Juan Rufz de Alarcón*. Su vida y su obra. Mexico: Edit. Cultura, 1943. 270 pp.

Dante, R.—*Antología poética latino-americana*. Buenos Aires: Molino, 1943. 254 pp.

Fernández de Almagro, M.—*Vida y literatura de Valle Inclán*. Madrid: Nacional, 1943.

Finot, E.—*Historia de la literatura boliviana*. Mexico: Porrúa Hnos., 1943. xix + 474 pp.

Garrigós, Florencio.—*Gramaticales y filológicas*. Buenos Aires: Tato, 1944. 245 pp.

Gracián, Baltazar.—*Agudeza y Arte de Ingenio*, ed. Sáinz de Robles y Correa Calderón. Madrid: Aguilar, 1944. 719 pp.

Grases, Pedro.—*Notas sobre filología*. Caracas: Edit. Elite, 1943. 23 pp.

Juan de la Cruz.—*El Cántico espiritual*, ed. M. Martínez Burgos. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1944. lxviii + 303 pp.

Lizón, Adolfo.—*Gabriel Miró y los de su tiempo*. Madrid: Viuda de Galo Sáez, 1944. 150 pp.

Monner Sans, Ricardo.—*Notas al castellano en la Argentina*. Buenos Aires: Angel Estrada, 1944. 389 pp.

Montserrat, S.—*Antonio Machado*, poeta y filósofo. Buenos Aires: Edit. Losada, 1943. 60 pp.

Mosé, J. N.—*Embarrassing Moments in Spanish and How to Avoid Them*. New York: Ungar, 1945. 93 pp. \$1.50.

Mujica Láinez, M.—*Poetas argentinos en Montevideo*. Buenos Aires: Emecé, 1943. 67 pp.

Ortiz de Montellano, B.—*Figura, amor y muerte de Amado Nervo*. Mexico: Ed. Xochitl, 1943. 164 pp.

Oyuela, Calixto.—*Estudios literarios*. T. II. Buenos Aires: Acad. Arg. de Letras, 1944. 466 pp.

Pittaro, J. M.—*Anécdotas fáciles*. New York: Macmillan, 1945. viii + 74 pp. \$0.48.

— *Conversación fácil*. *Ibid.*, 1945. viii + 87 pp. \$0.48.

Rojas Zorrilla, F. de.—*Del Rey abajo ninguno*, ed. P. Pou Fernández. Zaragoza: Edit. Ebro, 1944. 114 pp.

Sánchez de Lima, M.—*El Arte Poética en Romance Castellano*, ed. R. de Balbín Lucas. Madrid: Inst. Nicolás Antonio, 1944. xiv + 123 pp.

Sarrano Plaja, Arturo.—*Antonio Machado*. Buenos Aires: Schapire, 1944. 114 pp.

— *España en la edad de oro*. Buenos Aires: Edit. Atlántida, 1944. 279 pp.

— *Los místicos*. *Ibid.*, 1944. 143 pp.

Selva, J. B.—*Evolución del habla*. Buenos Aires: El Ateneo, 1945. 160 pp.

1945

rcón.  
tura,

tino-  
1943.

tera-  
onal,

blivi-  
ix +

s y  
5 pp.  
e de  
Cal-  
o.  
ogía.

tual,  
pasa-

e su  
1944.

lano  
ngel

oeta  
943.

s in  
*New*

s en  
943.

or y  
Ed.

r. II.  
944.

*New*  
0.48.  
viii

bajo  
oza:

a en  
cas.  
v +

ado.

mos

mos





# Princeton

UNIVERSITY PRESS

---

## WILLIAM ERNEST HENLEY

By JEROME HAMILTON BUCKLEY

Literary publicist, political propagandist, critic, lexicographer, poet, playwright, Henley became the Dr. Johnson of the 'nineties. Yet no previous biography has attempted a complete evaluation of his life and work; none has related Henley to the complex cultural milieu of late Victorian England. As a poet alone, Henley challenges attention which readers of "Invictus" dare not accord him. Trenchant essays and reviews and brilliant conversation attracted to him a whole league of younger writers, dedicated to a "counter-decadence" movement. This fully realized biography conveys the total impact of his personality, the permanent value of his creative effort, and the general vitality of his world.

*Illus.* \$2.75

## FOUR ESSAYS ON GULLIVER'S TRAVELS

By ARTHUR E. CASE

These four studies deal with the text, geography and chronology, political and historical references, and general significance and intent of *Gulliver's Travels*. Mr. Case, professor of English at Northwestern University, seeks to clarify some of the frequently debated problems in *Gulliver* with insight and meticulous scholarship. \$2.00

## THE USE OF THE DRAMA

By HARLEY GRANVILLE-BARKER

In this provocative little book, the great Shakespeare scholar considers the position of the drama among the humanities, and the use which can be made of it in general education. "Should be read by all teachers. It is written by a man who has profound knowledge of play writing and play acting, and who can write in the King's English."

—*N. Y. Herald Tribune.*

\$1.50

---

At your bookstore



PRINCETON University Press

Hooke and Miller  
**FRENCH REVIEW  
GRAMMAR**

*College Adoptions*



American International, Atlanta, Ball S. T. C. (Ind.), Colby, College of the Holy Names, William and Mary, Davidson, Duke, Elmira, Emory, Gettysburg, Greensboro, Hamilton, Hillsdale, Hollins, Huntingdon, Illinois, Illinois Wesleyan, Lawrence, MacMurray College for Women, Mercer, Mills, Mississippi College for Women, Nazareth, New York State, Princeton, Randolph Macon, Smith, Southern Seminary & Junior College, Sweet Briar, Akron U., Cincinnati U., Upsala, Utah St. Agric. College, Woman's College of the U. of North Carolina.

**HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY**

Ready in December

**PATTEE'S**  
**INTRODUCCIÓN A LA**  
*Civilización hispanoamericana*

The publication of this survey of Latin America by an eminent authority will be good news to many college teachers of intermediate Spanish.

In a stimulating, topical presentation it reviews the essential elements and vital problems with which North Americans must be familiar if they wish to gain a real understanding of Hispanic America. 348 p. \$1.80.

---

---

**D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY**

BOSTON NEW YORK CHICAGO ATLANTA SAN FRANCISCO DALLAS LONDON

80  
M  
L  
9